The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXV, No. 2 August, 1946

CONTENTS

Tolle, Lege! . . . . *Barnabas Ahern, C.P.* 81

Simulated Consent. Part II . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 89

An Aspect of Perfect Love of God . *Msgr. John M. Cooper* 101

Released Time for Religious Education. Part II
Joseph B. Collins, S.S. 121

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Privilege of the Little Office 138

Pope Pius XI and Religious Liberty 139

Communication of the Faculty to Binate 140

Mass Stipends 141

The Retention of the *Communicantes* in a Votive Mass . . 145

Carrying the Pax to an Attending Bishop 146

The Lighting of the Paschal Candle 146

ANALECTA 148

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1946, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

BOOK REVIEWS

What People Are: A Study of Normal Young Men, *by Clark W. Heath* 151

With Parables, *by Arthur Tonne, O.F.M.* 152

Living with Christ in God, *by Bernières-Louvigny* . . 153

Guerilla Padre in Mindanao, *by Edward Haggerty, S.J.* . 154

Sermon Outlines, *by William R. O'Connor* 154

Medical Ethics for Nurses, *by Charles J. McFadden, O.S.A.* 155

The Eucharistic Sacrifice, *by Edward Dahmus* . . . 156

BOOK NOTES 158

BOOKS RECEIVED 160

Timely and Practical
SUGGESTIONS

NUMBER ONE:

From time to time, your parishioners may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice.

Why not keep this in mind?

NUMBER TWO:

Do you bind your copies of *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* If you intend to do so, we can supply you with such copies as may be missing from your set, at the following rates:

1-10 years back.....45c ea.
11-20 years back.....50c ea.
21-30 years back.....60c ea.
31-40 years back.....70c ea.
41 years and up.....80c ea.

Address: Business Manager
The American Ecclesiastical Review
c/o Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E. Washington 17, D. C.

TOLLE, LEGE!

The lively interest of our laity in the recent New Testament translation forces upon the clergy of the country a striking reminder of priestly obligation. For the laity, the study of the New Testament is a matter of supererogation, conditioned in great part by personal fervor and conscientious desire to advance in the ways of God. But for the priest, a true devotion to Sacred Scripture is a duty incumbent upon him by reason of his very priesthood. Many other cultural interests in the life of a priest, such as music, art, and literature, are elective pursuits, chosen and developed in accord with personal taste and personal ability. Sacred Scripture, on the other hand, is a "must" interest demanded by norms, not personal, but objective.

At the dictate of God Himself, revealed in Sacred Scripture and transmitted faithfully by the commanding voice of concordant Tradition, the Bible is, as St. Ambrose called it "liber sacerdotalis" —the priestly book *par excellence*. Throughout the Old Covenant, the successors of Aaron and Levi were the official custodians of the Sacred Rolls: the people were to seek the Law at their mouth *(Mal. 2:7)*; for they (the priests) were to mediate on the Book of the Law day and night, that they might observe and do all things that were written in it *(Jos. 1:8)*. In the New Dispensation, this obligation of the old priesthood became even more imperative, for now the Sacred Books enshrined not only the created utterances of God but even the life and memory of His Divine Personal Word.

It is little wonder, then, that the Fathers of the early Church were so insistent on the priest's obligation to know and to love the Scriptures. In their eyes, neglect of this duty entailed infidelity not only to the priestly vocation, but even to Christ Himself. Thus, St. Jerome is uncompromising in this matter. For him, "to be ignorant of the Scripture is not to know Christ." Therefore, the Holy Doctor repeatedly counseled his young priest-friend Nepotian, "Often read the Divine Scriptures; yea, let holy reading be always in thy hand . . . For if Chirst is the power and wisdom of God, then he who does not know the Scriptures is unacquainted with God's wisdom and power." Because he had been faithful to his charge, the young Nepotian in

the hour of untimely death merited from St. Jerome these words of praise: "By careful reading and meditation Nepotian had made his heart a library of Christ's words."

We find this same insistence on devotion to Sacred Scripture not only in St. Jerome, but indeed in all the Fathers. Again and again in their writings, they repeat the pressing recommendation of St. Ambrose: "Drink from both the Old and the New Testament, for in both you will find Christ." Indeed, what a fruitful and pleasant task it would be to cull from the writings of the Fathers an anthology of their abundant testimonies to the need for Scripture study in the life of Christ's ministers.

But the force of example in the early Fathers is far more convincing even than their urgent counsels. All their life, intellectual and spiritual, was nourished by Sacred Scripture. For the priests of the early Church, instruction in Theology consisted, in most part, in the study of the Bible. From this source, too, their sermons, generally homiletic, drew theme and argument. In like manner, their spiritual life was simply a practical fidelity to the clear, straightforward demands of the scriptural exhortations to virtue.

With the multiplication of secondary Christian sources, however, an inevitable change took place. Of course, these works were demanded by the growing need for systematic and scholastic presentation of Christian doctrine. But only too often, priests were content to find the Word of God only in some secondary source, diluted by the water of human thought. Truly great priests, however, always continued to draw from the source of Truth itself—and with what great advantage to their priestly work! For nothing can make a man more familiar with Christ than the meditation, the study, and the seeking of Him in the Bible.

Is it not the devotion of Bossuet and Lacordaire to Sacred Scripture that gives the true explanation of their success as apostles of the word? The famous Bishop of Meaux made it a rule that the Bible and a concordance should always be at hand on the desk before him, for, as he was wont to say, "I could not live without them." This was the same sentiment that filled the heart of the eloquent Dominican, for he confessed, "I have read this book during thirty years and each day I discover in it new light. The

love of Scripture constantly grows with me. Every day I understand it better and better."

Fortunately, a contentment with secondary sources is no longer a matter of free choice for the priest of today. In the past four decades, successive Pontiffs have made insistent demands for a renewal of priestly devotion to Sacred Scripture. The *Providentissimus Deus* of Pope Leo XIII, the *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Pope Benedict XV, *motu proprio* letters of Pius X and Pius XI—these papal documents of recent years have sounded clarion calls to the priests of the world to be faithful to the obligations, assumed with the Minor Order of Lectorate and the Major Orders of Subdiaconate and Diaconate, of studying and cherishing the Sacred Books.

Every priest is familiar with this obligation of all clerics to read and study Sacred Scripture. All have read or at least heard of the encyclicals in which this duty is urged with clear and telling arguments from Scripture and Tradition. Yet, like every principle, this obligation bears repetition. Remembrance of it is especially important for those charged with the formation of future priests. For, if an awareness of this obligation governs the conduct of the seminary Scripture course, then class-room methodology and technique will be directed to the total end of preparing students for the fulfillment of a lifelong allegiance. The recognition of this guiding principle will result inevitably in the proposal of a triple purpose to be achieved in the ordinary seminary Scripture course. These three aims are: (1) to strive that every student may realize his obligation of an enduring devotion to Sacred Scripture; (2) to awaken interest in Sacred Scripture and thus to induce the students to relish the obligation of this study; (3) to present clearly, simply and adequately the introductory matter prescribed for the seminary course and, in this way, to lay a stable foundation for a profitable, intelligent and enduring devotion to Sacred Scripture.

It is immediately evident to all, however, that unless this very general obligation of the priest to study Sacred Scripture becomes clear-cut and detailed, it cannot be an effective and practical guide to profitable achievement. Therefore, after an assertion of this obligation, the question next in point is: what is the extent of this obligation? What does it demand of the priest in his ordinary, everyday life? Certainly, this question is fundamental and must

be answered satisfactorily and correctly before it will become a prudent and practical norm of action.

In order to gauge the extent of this obligation, we set forth the following propositions as helpful indications of the true solution.

(1) In their encyclical letters both Pope Leo XIII and Pope Benedict XV asserted that not all priests have the same proficiency nor the same opportunities for Scripture study. Accordingly, these Popes counseled that the solution of difficult and technical scriptural problems be left to specialists. Therefore, whereas both Pontiffs prescribe an adequate scientific preparation during the seminary Scripture course, they imply at the same time that, after Ordination, the average priest will be concerned chiefly with the superabundant positive content of the Sacred Books.

(2) St. John Chrysostom insisted that the repeated reading of Sacred Scripture—apart from any scientific study of it—will suffice to lay bare the riches of the Word of God, even for the ordinary Christian busy with the tasks of daily life. This is an assurance, also, for the clergy of our own day, since with their background of preparatory studies in Sacred Scripture and their reading knowledge of at least Latin and Greek, our priests are more than comparable to the Christian laity of St. John Chrysostom's day.

(3) Sacred Scripture is an inspired book which bears the message of God's own word. Therefore, it possesses an inherent power, holiness, and harmony which gleam forth on each page and captivate everyone who reads the Sacred Book in a spirit of reverence. Consistent effort to taste and appreciate this Divine Truth will be rewarded by an interior delight in the Word of God, which itself will offer a sure incentive to daily recourse to the Scriptures. Holy Writ is a manna which one relishes always, for it has in itself the Mercy, the Power, the Wisdom of God: in very truth, it is His own Divine Word.

These statements lead to the definite conclusion that it is at once requisite and yet sufficient for the average priest to express his devotion to Sacred Scripture by careful daily reading. Probably these propositions were chosen and worded in the light of personal conviction. Yet I believe that this underlying conviction represents a true objective estimate of the extent of the priest's obligation with reference to Sacred Scripture. For, if this reading

is accompanied by an intelligent reference to pertinent introductory matter covered in the seminary course, I am certain it will prove not only a sufficient but even an infallible means of penetrating into the hidden riches of Sacred Scripture.

Indeed, this was also the conviction of that ideal professor of Sacred Scripture, Father Fillion, S.S. For in this one, simple resolution, he, who in every matter of priestly guidance was always so prudently considerate of the limitations of time and talent, summed up his own recommendations on the study of the Bible by busy priests: "Let the daily reading or study of the Bible be one of the most rigidly observed practices of your rule of life. Devote at least one-half hour a day to this important task. To encourage such fidelity, appoint a special time in the day." May we not offer these words as an authoritative interpretation of Pope Leo XIII's counsel in *Providentissimus Deus*: "We wish and we desire . . . that those especially who have been called by the grace of God into Holy Orders, should day by day ever manifest more care and zeal for the reading of Holy Scripture, more carefully and zealously meditate on it, and explain it. Nothing is more in keeping with their office."

This suggestion of Father Fillion, I believe, represents in clear-cut precision the extent of our priestly obligation to study Sacred Scripture. To many of the clergy this requirement will appear extravagant, especially in view of our daily recitation of the Breviary with its contents so largely drawn from the Books of both Old and New Testament. Assuredly, for all priests, fidelity to this recommendation will demand some species of sacrifice. But really does it ask too much? After all, first things should come first: priestly interests must follow a hierarchy of values. If a daily half hour of Scripture reading seems to overbalance religious obligation, this may be an indication that previously the all-important spiritual element in our daily lives has been too greatly "streamlined" in order to lessen resistance against multiplied worldly interests. However, be that as it may, we are certain that the sacrifice of lesser interests to this half hour in prayerful study of God's Word will merit its own special reward. Mental prayer will be more fervent, vocal prayer more attentive and devout, our ministry more fruitful. Could we look for the same results, if we were to spend this same half hour in dallying over the newspaper or in marking time with light periodical literature?

These effects, however, are not infallible; a final consideration still calls for attention. How is Sacred Scripture to be read, that the priest may derive from his reading all possible benefit? First, let it be remarked that certainly every priest should read the whole of the Old and New Testament at least once in his life. The most opportune occasion for this, of course, occurs during the seminary course. After this bowing acquaintance to the entirety of Holy Writ, the young cleric will know what parts he is content to have read but once and what parts he desires to make the staple of his future study. Certainly, the whole of the New Testament, with its full revelation of the Divine Word, merits his chief attention. But in the Old Testament, too, especially in the Prophetic and Sapiential books, the priest will find many holy precepts and forceful exhortations, examples of virtue and promises of reward that claim repeated reading.

However, to achieve the full fruits of Scripture reading, it will be necessary to study the Sacred Books in a fashion far different from the cursory perusal of a morning newspaper. In very truth, the priest must "search the Scriptures" in an attitude of devout attention to each inspired utterance of the Sacred Writer. This ideal is realized only when the daily reading takes its *leitmotif* from the prayer before reading Holy Scripture, which may be found on the flyleaf of every Bible. Begun with a petition "that Christ by faith may dwell in our hearts," the reading of Scripture should be made in the spirit of prayer and contemplative meditation. Intellect and heart must both have their share, that in this atmosphere of light and warmth, the Word of Scripture may bear fruit in living and forceful convictions. For Sacred Scripture is truly the Book of Life, containing the science of Love. This thought has received apt expression in the words of the Apostle of the Sacred Heart, Father Mateo, who is now laboring so zealously in our country for the sanctification of priests. He writes: "To read the Gospel, to meditate on the Gospel . . . *to read between the lines* of the Gospel—this is the only means of knowing thoroughly Him whose mercy appears, at every instant, with an ineffable delicacy—Him Who is only love, sweetness and goodness. When we have understood, *with our heart,* the scenes of Bethany, the Prodigal Son, Magdalen, the Samaritan Woman, the woman taken in adultery . . . it will become impossible not to feel that a confiding love has taken birth in our soul, with the desire of living

in close intimacy with so gentle a Master, Who knows only how to cure, to raise up, to save and to pardon, but never how to condemn"—save only the proud and hypocritical.

Moreover, it is advisable to read with pen and notebook at hand, in order to preserve a memorandum of the many thoughts which will arise and which, perhaps, will never occur again. A loose-leaf notebook will best suit this purpose, since it makes provision for future insertions and thus assures an orderly and systematic arrangement of notes. The entries may be grouped under theme headings, or under the text references following the order of book, chapter and verse as presented in the Bible. Either of these methods will secure facility in the use of the Sacred Scripture notebook.

Later, these apt quotations and personal reflections gleaned from the prayerful study of God's own word will serve not only as guide-lines of conduct for the priest himself, but will also contribute a wealth of material to enrich his sermons and instructions. Blessed will be the day when, like the prudent householder of the Gospel, the priest can bring from his store of Scripture gleanings "new things and old," weighty with the wisdom of God: then he will realize to the full all the benefits of faithful daily devotion to the Word of God.

The benefit accruing to the priest from daily reading of Sacred Scripture was placed in strong white light by an incidental remark at a session of the Biblical Convention held in Cincinnati several years ago. At this conference one of the speakers, a professor of Sacred Scripture, concluded his appeal for a renewal of priestly devotion to the Scriptures with an account of what he considered the happiest achievement of his teaching career. Some time before, he said, a young priest had left the seminary to take his place as assistant in one of the larger parishes of the diocese. Possessed of only mediocre ability and without special proficiency in any field of clerical study, he had only one scholastic distinction to his credit—a long-standing fidelity to his professor's recommendation of a half hour's Scripture reading each day. Outside of that, he was just another student. Even in the midst of the pressing duties of parish life, the young assistant continued his seminary practice. Before long the notebooks, full of gleanings from Sacred Scripture, began to yield fruit. Though not eloquent in his delivery, his sermons attracted city-wide interest be-

cause of their rich, marrowy content and simple unction, similar to the Divine Word itself. When the time came for the customary removal of the young curate to the outlying country district, the bishop acceded to the universal request and left him in the large city parish, where he still continued a fruitful and extensive ministry.

Happily, the example of this young priest can be duplicated. Like him, every priest throughout the land may inscribe his own conduct as an effective and living commentary to the words of St. Paul to Timothy and, through him, to the whole order of the clergy: "Attend unto reading . . . Meditate upon these things" *(I Tim.* 4:13); "All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect—furnished to every good work" *(II Tim.* 3:15-17).

BARNABAS AHERN, C.P.

Chicago, Illinois

NEW INFIDELS AND OLD ARGUMENTS

Infidels, from the time of Celsus, Porphyry and Julian, have exhausted, in vain, the resources of human invention to discover implements to undermine the sublime fabric of Christianity. We must, therefore, not expect anything new from a modern infidel or atheist. All we can reasonably look for, is a revamping of the old and often-refuted sophistries of the past. By means of a ready tongue and a grotesque imagination, Mr. Ingersoll succeeds in galvanizing these sapless corpses into a momentary appearance of life, but they will sink, as they sank before, into oblivion, as the Christian world moves on.

—Father Louis A. Lambert, in *Notes on Ingersoll* (Buffalo, 1885), p. 16.

MISSION INTENTION

"Greater Zeal of Catholic Natives for the Conversion of Others" is the Mission Intention for the month of August, 1946.

SIMULATED CONSENT

PART II

Mary Carson Holmes [1] took the witness-chair before the dais at which sat the *Officialis* and the two pro-synodal judges. Directly in front of her, at a table before the judges' bench, sat the notary, a priest, ready to take down in long-hand whatever answers she had to give to the questions asked by the presiding judge.[2] He had already noted that she had taken the oath to tell the truth.[3]

The Defender of the Bond was seated at a table at the right of the witness-chair and a bit nearer the bench. Thence he could watch the faces of the witnesses and readily hand up to the bench any additional questions which he desired to have asked to clear up points developed in the course of the testimony of each.

The interrogation began with the usual general questions in English [4] from the presiding judge[5] as to the name of the person testifying, the names of her parents, her age, religion, occupation, quasi-domicile, and her position in the case.[6] The judges had already received from the notary's file the authenticated picture of Mary Carson Holmes so that they could establish for themselves the identity of the person before them.[7]

After these general questions came those particularly designed by the Defender of the Bond[8] to bring out the truth of the matter[9] with regard to the assertion that this marriage was null and void because John Holmes at the time he had said, "I will," did not really mean it, but was merely simulating consent.[10]

As Mary went along, telling her story as she had told it to Fr. Brown, the presiding judge stopped her from time to time to ask how she knew about certain things which she was stating for the record. He wanted to know how she knew things which she

[1] Cf. Instruction to be observed by diocesan tribunals in handling cases of nullity of marriages, S.C. Sacr., Aug. 15, 1936, *AAS*, XXVIII (1936), 313 (Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II, 471-530; Doheny, *Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases*), hereinafter cited by articles, Art. 110; 111; 113, §1.

[2] Cf. Art. 73; Can. 1585, §1; 374, §1, 1°; Art. 103, §2.

[3] Cf. Art. 110.

[4] Cf. Art. 105, §1.

[5] Cf. Art. 101.

[6] Cf. Art. 99, §§1, 2.

[7] Cf. Art. 58; 97.

[8] Cf. Art. 125, §2.

[9] Cf. Art. 102.

[10] Cf. Art. 99, §3; Can. 1774.

herself had not seen or been part of,[11] since there were obviously a good many points in her story which depended on hearsay from others.

It developed that she had observed a certain reluctance on John's part toward marrying her, but she admitted that he had actually married her before the Justice of the Peace, at that time, if only to give the baby a name. She could not state definitely that they had ever attached to their marriage contract a real "condition" as to future divorce. That had been merely "understood" between them. At least, John and she had expected that a divorce would follow.

Mary's mother had wanted the religious ceremony very much, but this was not entirely contrary to Mary's desires. She wanted to be able to receive the sacraments herself. Furthermore, there had been no threats of harm to Mary if the religious ceremony did not take place. The most that her mother had done was "nag" at her to get it taken care of.

John had not expressed any real opposition to the marriage before the chaplain, it turned out, but had merely felt that having gone through a ceremony once he did not need to go through it again. Finally, however, when Mary had explained how much it meant to her and to her family he had given in and agreed for her sake to go through with it. During their brief week-end honeymoon he had not really acted as if he hated the idea of being married to her.

It was after he had shipped out and had been at sea for some time that he wrote suggesting that she divorce him. They had the letters which she had given to Fr. Brown and could see for themselves what he had said.

All in all, Mary's story as she told it to the court did not sound too strong. This, however, was the testimony of one party to the marriage. It was not the testimony of a witness.[12] Then, too, there might be admissions by the other party that would supply what her story lacked.

Before Mary left the court-room her testimony was read back to her so that she might know how the priest had taken it down. Given the opportunity to make any changes or corrections she might desire, she allowed the statements to stand and swore to

[11] Cf. Art. 100; Can. 1774.

[12] Cf. Art. 117.

the truth of what she had said. She also swore to keep secret until the time for publication of the testimony in the case the questions asked of her and the answers which she had given.[13] Finally, Mary signed the record of her statements which the notary handed to her for that purpose, and then the *Officialis* signed it. The notary himself signed and dated it and initialed the various pages.[14]

When Mary's statements were on record before the court it was time to proceed to hear in subsequent sessions[15] what the other persons named on the list appended by Fr. Brown to the bill of complaint[16] as having knowledge of the character of the parties and of the circumstances of the marriage had to say on these points. First of all the court decided to call[17] Mary's mother. Although she was a blood-relative, and in ordinary cases would not be a satisfactory witness,[18] still, in a case involving, as does marriage, the civil or religious status of a person she would be acceptable.[19] Furthermore, it had been asserted that her conduct had influenced Mary in contracting the religious bond, at least to some extent, so it was necessary that the court be informed as to the nature of this influence, and the purpose with which it was exercised.

After she had taken the oath, touching the book of Gospels which lay on the desk in front of the notary, while swearing to tell the truth,[20] Mary's mother took her seat in the witness-chair. After the usual general questions to establish her identity, in addition to the letter of introduction which she brought from Fr. Wall,[21] and connection with the matters at issue,[22] she proceeded to tell the court what she knew of the case.

Mary, it seemed, had been going with John for some time, but her mother had never considered that they had serious intentions of getting married. John was not a Catholic and her daughter certainly would not think of marrying a non-Catholic, her mother had supposed. After all, the girl had been educated in Catholic schools and they, of course, had taught her that mixed marriages are not looked on with favor by the Church. She, herself, had

[13] Cf. Art. 104, §2; Can. 1769; 1780.
[14] Cf. *ibid.*
[15] Cf. Art. 106.
[16] Cf. Art. 125, §1; Can. 1761, §1.
[17] Cf. Art. 109.
[18] Cf. Art. 119, §3, 3°; Can. 1757, §3, 3°.
[19] Cf. Art. 122; Can. 1974.
[20] Cf. Art. 96; Can. 1622.
[21] Cf. Art. 97.
[22] Cf. Art. 99, §2.

never talked the matter over with Mary, because she had ex-expected that the nuns would train the girl properly. After all, that was what they were there for. As a matter of fact, Mary had never brought the subject up at home, and she had never suspected that the girl might be contemplating such a union.

Here she, the mother, had been going along serenely confident that some day Mary would find a nice Catholic boy and would marry him and have a family, and then, all of a sudden, she had noticed Mary's condition. Naturally she had been very upset, for at first she had thought that they would have to bear the stigma of a child born out of wedlock. She could not understand why the girl had not told her about this, but that was the way with girls these days, so independent their own mothers could not tell what they were thinking about.

Mrs. Carson was not too well acquainted with John Holmes. She knew he worked where Mary did and that he was not a Catholic, but he had never been at the Carson home, except to get Mary when they were going to some office dance, or to a show, or something like that. On those occasions, too, she had had so much to do that she had not been able to spend much time visiting with him. He had appeared to be a nice enough young man, and she had been so confident that her daughter knew what to do that she had not considered it necessary to look into the matter further. Probably she should have been more suspicious and pried into their affairs, but young people nowadays resented interference.

Mary had produced the marriage certificate signed by the Justice of the Peace when her mother had become upset over the discovery of her condition. That would, of course, assure the child of a name, but she could not for the life of her understand what could have induced her daughter to marry outside the Church. Naturally she had insisted that things should be fixed up at once. After all, she could not very well face the other women of her acquaintance if her daughter was not validly married.

Oddly enough, Mary had not seemed very anxious to have the marriage fixed up right away. The ideas young people get nowadays! Her mother had kept after her, but for one reason or another the girl had continued to put it off. She could have had it done immediately, and then there would not have been all the worry when she became so ill and had to go to the hospital and

lost the baby. Of course, John was away in training, but he was able to get a furlough to come and see Mary when she was in the hospital, so Mrs. Carson did not see why he could not have got one to come home for the marriage to be fixed up. After all, if he was any kind of a man he would have done so willingly rather than know that Mary was married outside the Church and could not receive the sacraments.

John had started to take instructions, Mary finally told her, and that at least was some consolation, but why he took them just for a mixed marriage rather than for Baptism, Mrs. Carson could not for the life of her see. When he was going off to war like that you would think that he would want to be baptized. Of course, a man who would run around with other women while his wife lay sick in the hospital was hardly the type one would want to take into the Church anyway. Mrs. Carson guessed that John was just all bad.

She had heard how John had been running around. She had not seen it herself, but some girls, friends of Mary, had told her what they had seen downtown while her daughter was in the hospital. It was certainly a comfort to know that some people, at least, would let you know where you stood. If it had not been for them Mary might never have known what sort of a man she had married.

Mrs. Carson emphatically disapproved of divorce. She knew the Church was against it, and she did not see how some priests could permit a divorced person to receive the sacraments, but Fr. Wall did. Still, she could not stand it for her daughter to continue to be married to a man like John Holmes. Mary knew she did not like the idea of divorce, but thinking it over later she felt that Mary had certainly done the right thing in divorcing that fellow. Maybe Mary could not be married again in the Church, but when you considered what kind of a man he was you could understand that she could not continue to live with him and be a wife to him. Even the Church could not ask that of a woman. There could hardly be a marriage made in Heaven where man thought as little of his wife as John apparently did.

In a way she was rather sorry now that she had urged the girl so strongly to get the marriage fixed up in Church, considering the difficulties which now presented themselves. Talking it over with Fr. Wall, Mrs. Carson had learned that if it were simply a

case of a marriage before a Justice of the Peace the marriage would have been no marriage at all for Mary,[23] and she would now, by getting the civil divorce, have simply caused her religious status to be recognized in the civil field as well, as regards property and the like. If she had known John Holmes then as she did now, she would certainly have advised Mary strongly against the religious ceremony with him. If Mary had just brought him home so that she could have got better acquainted with him!

When her testimony was read back to her so that she might know what had been written down,[24] Mrs. Carson asked to have her criticism of Fr. Wall with regard to giving the sacraments to a divorced woman stricken from the record, because, as she said, she remembered that that girl had been married before a Justice of the Peace just as Mary had, and she realized that Fr. Wall had been right in admitting her to the sacraments after her divorce had straightened out her civil status to correspond to her unmarried status in the eyes of the Church.

Sworn to secrecy as to the questions asked of her and the answers which she had given, Mrs. Carson left the court-room and the next witness was called.[25] John had made no objection to any of the witnesses,[26] nor had the Defender of the Bond, either on the ground of numbers[27] or on the matter of points to which each would testify.[28]

This next witness was the girl who had first told Mary that John had gone away because he had enlisted, not because he was simply called away on business, as he had said when he left promising to marry her on his return. Working in the same office with John and Mary she had been aware of how they felt about each other, or at least, of how Mary felt about John.

John, this girl thought, had not been too interested in Mary, at least no more so than he was in the other girls around the office; but Mary had been quite infatuated with him and had felt that he had eyes for no one else but herself. That he took other girls out on dates occasionally did not seem to matter to Mary. She simply excused it to herself and to her friends and continued to be starry-eyed about him.

[23] Cf. Can. 1094.
[24] Cf. Art. 104.
[25] Cf. Art. 127.
[26] Cf. Art. 126; 131.
[27] Cf. Art. 123, §2.
[28] Cf. Art. 125, §2.

The witness had thought, she said, that trouble was in the making, for Mary was so completely gone on the man that it was pathetic, but there was not much one could say to her. The girls had quite generally agreed among themselves that although John was a likeable chap and good company he was not the marrying type and while he might take girls out for a date he was careful not to get himself involved too deeply with any one of them. He was quite frank about his wish to "keep it light," and most of the girls in the office had resigned themselves to that sort of relationship. Mary, however, was the serious type who could not understand such an attitude and she had been hard hit.

She had tried to talk to Mary, the witness asserted, warning her that she should hold on tight to her heart and not allow her feelings to carry her away. John, she had warned, did not want to settle down as yet, and while he might be human, and subject to temptation, he would not like being caught. Mary, however, would not listen to this, and so it had happened.

Tearfully Mary had told this girl later of her fear that she might be pregnant, and of her worries since John had seemed so cold toward her since that last date. There was not much one could do by saying "I told you so." It had to be worked out as best it could.

Mary's fears were confirmed, of course, and then she had been almost frantic. She did not feel that she could tell her troubles at home, so she had poured them out to the girl who was now on the witness-stand. She had been determined to kill herself, at first, to hide her disgrace. Then, when this girl had succeeded in talking her out of that mood, Mary was ready to go out and kill John. More talk got that idea out of her head, at last, and then she wanted to go and confront John with the whole story and demand that he marry her. This was just what the witness had felt all along would be the wrong tactic so she persuaded Mary to wait for a time to see how John was acting toward her, whether he was really as cold as she imagined or whether he was only acting as he had always acted.

Finally John had to know what had happened. Then it was his turn to be upset and worried. He and the present witness had gone over the whole thing. He had had no intention of getting Mary into trouble, that he swore. It was just one of those times when will-power failed, and now here they both were in a mess.

He did not want to be married to Mary for life. She was a good kid, and fun on a date, but she was definitely not the type he had in mind for a wife. He thought of an abortion, as Mary had for a time, but the girl on the stand explained to him that she and Mary had discussed that and had come to the conclusion that Mary could not do it. In the first place the Church forbade it,[29] and, furthermore, it might be the death of Mary. The witness had known of another girl who had tried that way out and had died herself, screaming curses at the man. John quickly gave up that idea. He guessed, finally, there was nothing else for him to do but marry the girl and give the baby a name. After all, she could get a divorce later and he would be free, for he certainly did not want to be tied to her for life.

This witness then explained to John that Mary was a Catholic and that Catholics did not believe in divorce, so that would not be a solution, either. The witness thought that it must have been about this time that John had enlisted.

The way that the present witness had known that he was going away and was not coming back, was that she and her boy-friend had met him on the street near the station one evening. He was carrying a traveling bag and as they stood and chatted he had mentioned that "this is it," that he was going off to boot-training. Feeling that Mary should know of this development, the witness and her friend had gone to see Mary and had told her that John was going away and that she would not see him again. He had not exactly said that he would not return, but considering that he did not want to be married permanently to Mary and that she could not get a divorce if she got married to him, they considered it a reasonable assumption that he would never come back. They had done what they could to calm Mary down, she became so upset over this news, but she took it very hard, poor girl.

This witness had seen John when he came home on that furlough and had told him that Mary wanted to see him. He said he had been getting letters from her and that he had found a way to give the baby a name and still not be tied down permanently. He had met a Catholic boy in training who had been married before a Justice of the Peace, and then had been divorced, and finally had been married by a priest. If the boy he had met could

[29]Cf Can. 2350, §1.

do that, then there was no reason why Mary could not marry John before a Justice of the Peace, divorce him, so they would both be free, and then get married to some one else.

That was how John and Mary had come to decide on a marriage before the Justice of the Peace. Mary had not liked the idea, for she knew that it was no marriage at all, but she had felt that at least it would provide for the baby, and maybe she could make John see things differently as time went on.

It was this same witness who with her boy-friend had seen John with other women at the time Mary was in the hospital at the time she lost the baby. That time, too, the couple had been strolling along the main street of the city when they happened to see some one who looked like John come out of a bar with two girls and get into a car at the curb driven by another man. They were close enough to recognize that it was John in the uniform, but they could not overhear what was being said. The party did not look drunk, but then, John always could carry his liquor, and the people were laughing. The witness did not know where the car went, but she did not think that it was very nice of John to be acting like that while Mary was so sick in the hospital. It was after visiting hours, to be sure, and Mary had told them when they were at the hospital earlier that John was coming in that evening. The next day she told them that he had been there as long as visitors were permitted to stay, but they still did not think that he should have been doing what he did.

They had not told Mary at that time about what they had seen, for she was in no condition to be upset, as she would have been by such news, but when she had come back from the coast they had informed her. This was after she had been married in the church ceremony. They had not really seen him do anything except cross the sidewalk and get into the car, but that in itself looked bad, they thought.

The next three witnesses, all girls who had gone to school with Mary, had less information to offer than the one who had been her confidante. They knew that Mary had been married out of the Church because John had got her into trouble, and that she had subsequently divorced him, but that was all the information they could contribute.

As the witnesses had answered the questions put to them the notary had been writing down their answers. The testimony of the

first two, the mother and the confidante of Mary, had been quite long, but it seemed necessary to permit this in order to get all the information possible. Those two had been loquacious so that at times the presiding judge had had to summarize the answer and direct that the notary record his summary rather than the diffuse expressions of the witness. The last three witnesses, however, had not much to contribute, and it was with difficulty that they were induced to say more than "yes," or "no."[30]

The court next took up the proof offered in John's letters to Mary.[31] These had been presented with the bill of complaint. Copies had been made and sent to John that he might say whether or not he had written them and whether all that he had written were included.[32] As far as he could remember these were all the letters he had written, and these were certainly his, was his answer.

In them John told Mary that he did not see any reason for a second marriage ceremony when they were already legally married by the Justice of the Peace. That would take care of the baby, and after all she would not care to be tied to him permanently, he was certain, so why go through with another ceremony? These were the first letters written while he was in boot-camp.

Her barrage of letters was reflected in a changed tone in his replies as he continued to write her from boot-camp and from his first station. He told of meeting the chaplain and how much he liked the priest. He began to sound as if he were interested in what the chaplain told the men at Mass on Sunday mornings. John apparently was attending the Catholic services regularly at that time, in the company of some of his ship-mates. Gradually his letters expressed more and more concern about the way her mother was nagging at her to get the marriage fixed up in Church. Finally he said that he would see the chaplain and take instructions. Some of his pals had told him that it would take less time to receive the instructions for a mixed marriage and that was what he planned to do.

There was an interruption at this point in the continuity of the letters which more or less corresponded with the testimony on record as to the time when Mary had lost the baby. When the letters began again he reported that he was back on his station

[30] Cf. Art. 129. [31] Cf. Art. 163, §1. [32] Cf. Art. 163, §2.

and that they were working very hard. He was not having much chance to continue the instructions. The last letter in this group agreed that perhaps it would be better for Mary to get away from her mother for a time. He said he would find a place for her to live near the station if she wanted to come out there. He hoped that she was sufficiently recovered to make the trip.

John's next letter was written and sent through a Fleet Post-office, so apparently he was out of the country at that time. In this letter he mentioned that she might not have to worry about a divorce to be free from him. Of course, if she wanted to get one it would be all right with him, and she could use this letter for that purpose; but the way things looked it would all be fixed up by him. Mary had, apparently, interpreted this to mean that he wanted her to get the divorce after all; but to the judges it looked as if John did not expect to come back alive. Of course, at the time Mary had received the letter she had already been informed by her friends about John's "running around" while she was sick in the hospital and that may have colored her interpretation of the letter.

Pondering over this collection of letters, the judges tried to weigh them in the light of the circumstances and especially of the time at which they were each written.[33]

The judges next took up the copy of the decree of divorce obtained by Mary. This, of course, afforded only a statement that the decree had been granted according to her petition, without setting forth the evidence adduced at the trial. Mary had, however, procured from her lawyer a copy of the transcript of evidence taken at the trial. This was now presented for the consideration of the judges.[34]

Reading the transcript, the judges found that Mary had been sworn as witness and had stated briefly that John and she had not been able to get along because of incompatibility. Her lawyer then testified that he had known her for a considerable length of time and that he believed that her statements under oath could be taken by the court. There was little or nothing else of importance in the few pages of testimony.

The court now authorized a rogatory commission to the court of the diocese in which was situated the hospital where John was

[33] Cf. Art. 164.

[34] Cf. Art. 168.

recuperating. The Defender of the Bond, therefore, prepared a list of questions to be put to John to bring out his side of the story.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The August, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* presents as its leading article an English translation of Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter on Christian Unity—*Satis cognitum* (June 29, 1896). Clearly and unequivocally the great Pontiff asserts the immutable doctrine of the unique position of the Catholic Church: "The mystical body of Christ is the true Church. . . . The church alone offers to the human race that religion—that state of absolute perfection—which Christ wished, as it were, to be incorporated in it. And it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence." (A greater emphasis on this doctrine would be commendable nowadays, when we hear so much about "the right of everyone to practice whatever religion he chooses"). . . . Fr. Gigot, S.S., contributes a scholarly article on the Septuagint. . . . An interesting explanation of the hymns of the Office of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist is given by Fr. H. T. Henry, of Overbrook Seminary. . . . Fr. F. E. Gilliat Smith writes from Bruges, Belgium, on the proposed reform of the Breviary under Pope Benedict XIV, who wished to inaugurate "an honest correction of our Breviary." The author concludes: "We are still waiting for an honest correction of our Breviary." (The task projected by Pope Benedict XIV was finally undertaken by Pope Pius X). . . . We are informed that the Abbé Duchesne received the degree of Doctor of Letters from the University of Cambridge, and that in the complimentary address delivered on that occasion there was an unmistakable allusion to the fact that the Abbé defended the validity of Anglican Orders. (It must be remembered that the final decision on Anglican Orders was not delivered by the Pope until September, 1896.)

F. J. C.

AN ASPECT OF PERFECT LOVE OF GOD

Deharbe began his treatise, one of our best modern ones on perfect love of God, with the following words:

> There is hardly any theological question upon which there is greater diversity of opinion, and even vagueness of concept, than upon the difference between perfect and imperfect love of God. . . . Thus the writer of a catechism has a difficult task to discern the correct universally approved and accepted teaching, and to express it accurately in a few clear words. . . . It is the express unquestioned teaching of the Church that there is a perfect love or contrition which cannot occur in man without forgiveness of his sins, which consequently reconciles the sinner with God even outside the Sacrament of Penance, provided it includes the desire of the same. As to what, however, constitutes the essence of this perfect love and how it must be distinguished in its characteristics from imperfect love, the Church has not to date given formal decision.[1]

Basic Catholic doctrine on the subject is, of course, quite clearly and definitively expressed in the consistent teaching of the Fathers and theologians and in a considerable number of official Church decisions and pronouncements. On the other hand, some points of very practical significance, not only to the theologian, but also to the parish priest and to the catechist and religious educator, are not.

It is the purpose of the present paper to examine one such point, on which there appears to prevail some uncertainty and hesitation. The point is the following: "Is an act of love or contrition perfect only if the person making it is so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward for doing it and no punishment for not doing it?"

Before presenting the evidence that bears on the question, we have to define in concise detail what the question means and does not mean.

First, the question refers to the act itself of perfect love such as may be made from time to time transitorily and *per modum abstractionis*, not to the habitual state (*status habitualis*) or total consciousness or disposition of the person making it. It asks:

[1] Deharbe, *Die vollkommene Liebe Gottes in ihrem Gegensatze zur unvollkommenen* (Regensburg, 1856), pp. 1 f.

"What constitutes an act of perfect love?" and not: "May a person who has perfect love of God have at the same time imperfect love?" A given person at a given time may, of course, have both perfect and imperfect love or contrition. The two loves are quite compatible, and can coexist in the same person.[2] In fact, emphatically they should coexist. The opposite doctrine, namely, that the desire of heaven and fear of hell are incompatible with love of God for His own sake, in the sense that they should be excluded from the total consciousness of the person who has perfect love, or in the sense that the person who has perfect love should have no desire of heaven or fear of hell, is sheer Quietism or Semiquietism. Such Quietism and Semiquietism have been sternly condemned by the Church in a whole series of official pronouncements that are readily accessible in Denzinger or in nearly any of our modern Catholic theological treatises on hope, charity, or the virtue of penance. We may merely add that in one who wishes to live his life dominantly on the level of perfect love of God, imperfect love (*amor concupiscentiae*), should be subordinated to perfect love (*amor benevolentiae*).[3] In a recent short contribution to *The American Ecclesiastical Review*,[4] it is charged that such Quietism is sometimes found in (presumably American) Catholic books of instruction or piety and is even proposed in religion classes. No evidence is presented to support the charge, so we find it difficult to discuss it adequately. To prove the negative would be an endless task. The present writer can only record that in forty years of teaching religion to classes of both boys and of girls from the primary grades to the postgraduate level and of associating with teachers of religion from many campuses and many religious orders, he has never, to his memory, come across a single instance of such quietistic nonsense taught by American teachers of religion. Nor has he ever encountered it in religion textbooks. Before writing the present paragraph, he has just made a rapid search through about thirty of the most widely used

[2] Cf., *e.g.*: T. Bouquillon, *Institutiones theologiae moralis specialis: Tractatus de virtutibus theologicis* (Bruges, 1878), pp. 268 ff; D. Palmieri, *Tractatus de poenitentia*, 2nd ed. (Prati, 1896), pp. 265 ff; Deharbe, *loc. cit.*, pp. 179-201.

[3] Cf. Palmieri, *loc. cit.*, pp. 265 f.; cf. Sylvius, cited *infra*, footnotes 37-38.

[4] "Unselfish love of God," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXIII, 1 (July 1945), 59.

American Catholic textbooks in religion and can find no trace therein of such heretical doctrine. It would seem that our American temperament, whatever it is, is not quietistic!

That a rare student, given the complexity of the subject of supernatural love, may misunderstand and misinterpret, in such a quietistic sense, even the most faultless class teaching in lay school or seminary is, of course, possible. The present writer cannot recall ever having met such a case. On the other hand, religion teachers, like seminary professors, of any years of experience in correcting examination papers, would usually be loath to set any limits to the ingenuity and resourcefulness of some students in misunderstanding and misinterpreting what is taught from the classroom rostrum. Let us return, after this short digression, to our main subject.

Secondly, our question should not be confused with a question or questions such as the following: "Is an act of love or contrition perfect only if the person making it is so disposed that he would do God's will even though God were in no sense his good, or had no love for him, or had done him no good?" As its *fundamentum* or *radix ontologica*, love can seek only what is in that sense its good. "If *per impossible* God were not the good of man, there would be no basis (*ratio*) for man to love Him".[5] Loving God and doing His will because He has loved us, thus returning love for love, or because He has been good to us, thus loving and obeying Him out of pure gratitude, is quite a different thing from loving and obeying Him out of expectation of future temporal or eternal reward or out of fear of future punishment.

Thirdly, our question has nothing to do with certain extreme "heroic" hypothetical sayings or prayers recorded of some saints: for instance, "Were I due on the last day to receive hell as my lot, I would not on that account let myself be turned away from the service of my Creator," approvingly cited from a pious anecdote by St. Catherine of Siena;[6] or, "Should it please Thee, my God, to allot me my dwelling-place in hell, I would be content therewith,

[5] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 26, a. 13, ad 3. Palmieri, *loc. cit.*, pp. 264 f.; C. Mazzella, *De Virtutibus infusis praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae*, 3rd ed. (Rome, 1884), p. 707; T. Pesch, *Institutiones psychologicae* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1898), III, 233 ff.

[6] (Letter) A Soeur Bartolomea della Seta, in *Les plus belles lettres de Sainte Catherine de Sienne*, tr. P. H. Michel (Paris, 1927), p. 99.

provided only that Thou sawest to it that this happened without offence to Thee and that my suffering redounded to Thy everlasting glory," attributed to St. Jane Frances de Chantal.[7] The making of such hypothetical aspirations is certainly not required for perfect love. They are permissible, transitorily and *per modum abstractionis*.[8] They are surely not to be suggested or recommended indiscriminately, if ever—for obvious practical pastoral and pedagogical reasons.

Fourthly, our question should be distinguished from its reverse, namely: "Has a person perfect love of God if he is so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward from God for doing it or punishment for not doing it?" In other words, is such a disposition in all cases a proof of perfect love? The discussion of this matter would carry us at once into the heart of a long controversy, namely: Must love, to be perfect, be unselfish love of God on account of His infinite perfections, or does unselfish love of God out of a sense of pure gratitude toward God also constitute perfect love? The more prevalent theological opinion holds that love of God, to be perfect, must be on account of His infinite perfections, but the minority opinion, that love of God out of pure gratitude also constitutes perfect love, has at least good probability. This whole controverted issue demands thorough critical restudy both of historical views and of the theologically scientific evidences therefor,[9] but we are not concerned with it in the present paper. For the rest, in actual life, love of God as merciful or generous readily passes into love of God for His infinite perfections.

[7] Quoted by Deharbe, *loc. cit.*, p. 182 (original not accessible to me); other examples, *ibid.*, pp. 182 ff., and in J.-B. Bossuet, *Ordonnance et instruction pastorale . . . sur les états d'oraison, livre 9*, nn. 1-5, *passim*, in *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1828), XXXVI, 352-70.

[8] Cf. Benedict XIV, *Opus de servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, lib. 2, c. 31, nn. 11-14, in *Opera omnia* (Prati, 1839), II, 291 ff.

[9] Cf. Fr. Suarez, *De charitate*, disp. 1, sect. 2, n. 3, in *Opera omnia* (Paris, 1858) XII, 637; Joannes de Lugo, *De virtute, et sacramento poenitentiae*, disp. 5, sect. 1, n. 3-9, in *Opera* (Venice, 1718), VI:22 f.; J. Scheeben (L. Altzberger), *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1901), IV, 694. The impressive evidence advanced by Deharbe, *loc. cit.*, pp. 139-79, for the thesis that love of pure gratitude is perfect love has not, to the present writer's knowledge, been adequately discussed by more recent theologians.

Fifthly, it may be recalled that one can desire to attain the Beatific Vision and to be with God eternally out of either perfect or imperfect love or out of both together. If I love a friend and desire to be with him in order to give him pleasure or to do good to him in some way, I am in so far loving him disinterestedly. If I desire to be with him for my own enjoyment of his company or for the good he does me or the pleasure he gives me while I am with him, I am in so far loving him interestedly. In like manner, the desire to be with God for eternity is disinterested in so far as the person having it wishes to attain the Beatific Vision in order thereby to glorify and honor God the more perfectly. Such disinterested desire is an integral part of perfect love of God. The desire to be with God for eternity is interested in so far as the person having it wishes to attain the Beatific Vision purely or primarily for his own eternal felicity and enjoyment. Such interested desire is in so far part of imperfect love of God.[10]

Sixthly and lastly, the question we are examining, namely, "Is an act of love or contrition perfect only if the person making it is so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward for doing it and no punishment for not doing it?" if answered in the affirmative, implies that a person having perfect love or contrition should be able to say, and in his heart mean it, "If there were no reward from God in this life or in the next for obeying His will and no punishment for disobeying Him, I would still with His grace do my best for His sake to obey His holy will." "I would" in this case means of course efficacious purpose of will, not prediction of intellect. Theologically and theoretically if he could not say this and mean it he would not have perfect love or contrition, although in practice, owing to misunderstanding or confusion, exceptional cases may occur—a point to which we shall return later in touching upon the pastoral and pedagogical phases of the problem.

Having defined our question, we may now review the theological evidence bearing upon it, and after that shall consider briefly some of the pastoral and pedagogical *sequelae*.

In view of the present writer's limitations as well as of limitations of space, the evidence to be presented must of necessity be representative rather than exhaustive. The greater part of the

[10] Cf. Bouquillon, *loc. cit.*, p. 272; Palmieri, *loc. cit.*, pp. 259, 266; Deharbe, *loc. cit.*, pp. 197-200.

evidence is drawn from the masters of the golden age of scholastic theology, the thirteenth century, and of the brilliant revival of the century following the Council of Trent. In the quotations, the sense in which the word "charity" is used, to denote either perfect love or both perfect and imperfect love, will be clear in most cases from the context. The translations, except in one case to be noted, are our own. We have rendered *amor benevolentiae* (perfect love) as "love of benevolence"; *amor concupiscentiae* (imperfect love) as "love of desire"; *amor amicitiae* as "love of friendship." In the thirteenth century the terms *amor benevolentiae* and *amor amicitiae* were often used synonymously. In presenting the evidence we shall follow chronological order.

Charity proper or perfect love of God is ordinarily defined as a supernatural virtue by which we love God above all things for His own sake and our neighbor as ourselves for the love of God. Perfect contrition is sorrow for sins that arises from such charity or perfect love.

As this core concept of perfect love is explained and developed in patristic and scholastic tradition, it includes three main closely related notes that bear directly upon the question under discussion. First, perfect love of God is love of Him for His own sake, *propter se;* second, it is love of God without view or motive of reward as such, *sine intuitu praemii;* third, it is such love as would be given even if there were no reward from God for giving it or punishment from Him for not giving it.

A thorough critical study of the patristic evidence bearing on perfect love in general or on our specific problem in particular has not, to the writer's knowledge, been made, and such a study would be beyond his competence. From random soundings he has made, it would seem that, while love of God is profusely treated therein, our specific problem receives its fullest, and perhaps its first adequate treatment, in the writings of St. Augustine (†430).[11] His views may be gathered from the following passages:

[11] Cf., however, Clement of Alexandria, St. Gregory Nazianzus, St. Basil the Great and St. Ambrose, cited *infra.* Many of the numerous patristic citations given, without critique, in Eus. Amort, *Idea divini amoris,* in his *Disquisitiones dogmaticae,* n. 4 (Venice, 1745), pp. 162-226, have a bearing on our problem.

I call by the name of charity the movement of the soul to love God *(ad fruendum Deo)* for His own sake and one's self and his neighbor for God's sake.[12] [*Frui* here means to cleave by love to something for its own sake.][13]

Consider first in what manner the love of friendship should be disinterested *(gratuitus)*. For you should not have or love a friend with the view of him giving you something. A friend should be loved without thought of recompense *(gratis)* for his own sake, not for the sake of something else. If the rule of friendship urges you to love man disinterestedly, how disinterestedly should God be loved who commands you to love man.[14]

By chaste fear charity which drives out this fear fears to sin, even if no punishment were to follow *(Timore autem casto ipsa, quae hunc timorem foras mittit, peccare timet caritas, etiamsi sequatur impunitas)*.[15]

A good man . . . if he could hear God saying to him, "I see thee when thou sinnest, I shall not damn thee, but thou displeasest me," unwilling to displease his Father, not his dreadful judge, fears, not lest he be damned or punished or tormented, but lest he offend paternal pleasure, lest he displease his loving [Father].[16]

And he [the Christian], moreover, as he advances will attain to such a mind that he loves God more than he fears hell; so that even were God to say to him "Enjoy carnal delights forever, and sin as much as you are able, yet you shall neither die nor be cast into hell, but this only, you shall not be with me" he would shudder at it, and would not sin at all, yet no longer to avoid falling into that which once he dreaded, but that he might not offend Him whom he so loves. . . .[17]

For the Eastern church we may cite St. Gregory Nazianzus († c. 390):

I know that there are three classes of those who attain salvation, namely, slaves, hirelings and sons. If thou art a slave, fear blows.

---

[12] St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, lib. 3, c. 10, n. 16 (*MPL*, XXXIV, 72).

[13] *Ibid.*, lib. 1, c. 4 (*MPL*, XXXIV, 20).

[14] *Sermo* 385, c. 4, in *Opera* (Venice, 1763), VIII, 1520; cf. St. Ambrose, *De Abraham*, lib. 2, c. 8, n.47 (*MPL*, XIV, 476).

[15] *Sermo 25 in Ps. 118, ibid.* (1761), VI, 716.

[16] *Sermo 161 in 1. Cor. 6, ibid.* (1762), VII, 779.

[17] *De catechizandis rudibus*, tr. and comm. J. P. Christopher, The Catholic University of America Patristic studies, Vol. 8 (Washington, D. C., 1926), c. 17, n. 27, pp. 74 ff. (translation in our text is that of Christopher).

If a hireling, look only to pay. But if thou risest above these, and art a son, revere [God] as a father. Apply thyself to good works, because it is good to obey [thy] father, even if no gain were to accrue to thee therefrom. Serving thy father is its own reward.[18]

Indeed we even rise higher (I speak of those who are truly philosophers and who have true love of God): to wit, [we] who long to be united to good on account of the good itself, not on account of honors laid up in the other world.[19]

The early scholastic period is best represented, as regards our problem, in the works of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (†1153):

Serve [the Lord] in that charity which drives out fear, is insensible to hardship, does not consider reward, does not look for recompense *(meritum non intuetur, praemium non requirit)*.[20] [Just previously in the context St. Bernard also counsels serving the Lord in fear, in hope, and in view of reward.]

Actually love of God does not go unrewarded although He should be loved without view to reward *(Non enim sine praemio diligitur Deus, etsi absque praemii intuitu diligendus sit)* . . . True love rests content with itself. It has a reward, the possession of the loved . . . True love does not look for reward, but does deserve reward *(Verus amor praemium non requirit, sed meretur)* . . . How much the more does the soul that loves God look for no other reward of its love than God Himself! Or, if it looks for something else, then surely it is this something else, and not God, that it loves.[21]

I am suspicious of a love which a hope of acquiring something else seems to support . . . Pure love is not mercenary. Pure love does not derive its force from hope . . .[22]

Still more explicit are the views of the golden age of scholasticism, the thirteenth century, as represented in the writings of St. Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus.

[18] St. Gregory Nazianzus, *Oratio 40, In sanctum baptisma*, n. 13 (*MPG*, XXXVI, 374 f); cf. his friends, St. Basil the Great (probable author), *Regulae fusius tractatae, Prooemium*, 3. (*MPG*, XXXI, 895).

[19] *Oratio* 4, *Adversus Julianum I*, n. 60 (*MPG*, XXXV, 582 f.), cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, lib. 4, c. 22 (*MPG*, VIII, 1347).

[20] St. Bernard, *Epist.* 143, n. 3 (*MPL*, CLXXXII, 300).

[21] *De diligendo Deo*, c. 7, n. 17 (*MPL*, CLXXXII, 984 f.).

[22] *Sermones in cantica canticorum, sermo* 83, n. 5 (*MPL*, CLXXXIII, 1183).

Charity does not exclude consideration of that reward [*viz.*, God and those things which unite God to us], although it does not look to the reward as reward *(licet non respiciat eam ut merces est)*, but as the beloved to be cleaved to [or enjoyed] *(ut dilectum ad perfruendum)*. . . . Charity does not look to eternal reward as reward, but as the beloved to be cleaved to *(ut amatum ad fruendum)*, and this is why Bernard says that thou shouldst not confess the Lord because He is good to thee . . . but because He is good absolutely.[23]

A man who has charity would act the same even if no recompense were to follow *(Homo habens caritatem etiam operaretur, si nulla retributio sequeretur)*.[24]

In charity there are two movements *(motus)*, that of friendship and that of desire *(concupiscentiae)*. The movement of friendship is that by which one longs to please and serve God; the movement of desire is that by which one longs to have and see God. When therefore Bernard says that God should be served without view to reward *(sine intuitu praemii)*, he has in mind the love of friendship. For if a man out of friendship love serves his friend and loves him without view to reward, as the Philosopher says, much more should man out of love of charity wish good to God without view to recompense; but this does not prevent him from craving and wishing, by reason of love of desire, to attain that supreme reward which he strives ultimately to reach.[25]

[The virtue of charity is distinct from] hope, because its act is not to covet good to the one loving insofar as this good is to the advantage of the one loving, but to tend to the object of love in itself, even if *per impossibile* advantage to the one loving were removed from it *(sed tendere in objectum secundum se, etiamsi per impossibile circumscriberetur ab eo commoditas ejus ad amantem)*.[26]

For the first period, the pre-Tridentine, of the modern epoch, we may cite Blessed Juan de Avila (†1569):

Even if there were no hell that threatened, nor Paradise that allured, nor commandment that restrained, the just man would do what he

---

[23] St. Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii in III sententiarum*, dist. 29, a. 4, in *Opera omnia* (Paris, 1894), XXXVIII, 550.

[24] St. Thomas Aquinas, *In IV libros sent.*, lib. 3, dist. 18, q. 1, a. 5, ad 1.

[25] St. Bonaventure, *Commentaria in IV libros sent.*, lib. 3, dist. 27, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2, in *Opera omnia* (Quaracchi, 1887), III, 607.

[26] John Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones in 3um librum sent.*, dist. 27, q. unica, n. 2, in *Opera omnia* (Paris, 1894), XV, 355 f.

does *(obraria)* [cf. *operaretur, supra,* of St. Thomas] for the sole love of God; for as the Holy Ghost brings about in man toward God what human generation brings about in the heart of the son toward his father, since through the Holy Ghost and His grace we receive the adoption of the sons of God, thus it comes to pass that such a just man, like the loving son, reverences and serves God by reason of the filial love he bears Him.[27]

To this period, and to, among others, St. Francis Xavier (†1552), St. Ignatius Loyola (†1556), or St. Teresa of Avila (†1582), was formerly attributed by some writers the matchless *Soneto a Cristo crucificado*—best known to American Catholics in Fr. Hesero's Latin metrical paraphrase of 1665 (or Fr. Francisco Garcia's, 1672) beginning "O Deus, ego amo Te," or in Fr. Caswall's English rendering of the same paraphrase, in six stanzas, the first beginning "My God, I love Thee."[28] The *Soneto*, however, has not, to date, been traced back in printed sources beyond 1628, and its author, almost certainly not any of the three above-mentioned saints, is unknown.[29] That St. Francis

[27] Bl. Juan de Avila, *Libro espiritual, sobre el verso Audi filia, & Vide, etc.*, c. 50, in *Obras* (Madrid, 1759) III, 283.

[28] For full text of original *Soneto* in Spanish (*No me mueve, mi Dios, para quererte*) cf.: H. J. Coleridge, The life and letters of St. Francis Xavier (London, 1886), I, 315; R. Foulché-Delbosc, "Le sonnet a Cristo crucificado," in *Revue hispanique* (1895), II, 120; E. A. Peers, *Studies in the Spanish Mystics* (New York and Toronto, 1927-30), I, v; J. Hurtado y J. de la S., and A. González Palencia, *Historia de la literatura española*, 4th ed. (Madrid, 1940), I, 433. For minor variants of same cf.: *Monumenta xaveriana*, (Madrid, 1899-1914), I, 934-38, II, 1006; A. M. Carreño, *Fr. Miguel de Guevara y el célebre soneto castellano "No me mueve, mi Dios, para quererte"* (México, 1915), 115 f.; J. Zarco Cuevas, (De re litteraria), in *Ciudad de Dios* (Madrid, 1925), CXLII, 131. For text of Latin versions, *Ut Te colam, Deus meus* and *O Deus, ego amo Te*, cf.: Coleridge, *loc. cit.*, I, 315 f.; *Mon. xav., loc. cit.*, I, 932 ff.; Foulché-Delbosc, *loc. cit.*, II, 130 f.; Eus. Amort, *Theologia eclectica moralis et scholastica* (Bononiae, 1753), pars 1, disp. 1, quaest. 1, quaer. 22, IV, 68. Other Latin versions in: *Mon. xav.*, Nádasi's) *loc. cit.*, I, 938 f.; Carreño, (Abad's *loc. cit.*, p. 57. For English versions cf.: John Dryden's, fairly free, of *O Deus, ego amo Te*, in Coleridge, *loc. cit.*, I, 316, and Carreño, *loc. cit.*, p. 244; Fr. Caswall's, fairly close, in *Edward Caswall, Hymns and poems*, 2nd ed. (London, 1873), p. 152; Peers', fairly literal, in Peers, *loc. cit.*, I, vi. There are also Italian, French and German versions (Carreño, *loc. cit.*, p. 43; L. Pfandl, *Geschichte der spanischen Nationalliteratur in ihrer Blütezeit* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1926), p. 148.

[29] The evidence is discussed at length in: Foulché-Delbosc, and Carreño,

Xavier may have known and have recommended to the Portuguese colonists in India some earlier metrical composition embodying the thoughts of the *Soneto* is possible, but the evidence for such a conclusion is very tenuous. So far then as this poem is concerned, his name cannot be brought forward in support of our thesis. On the other hand, the *Soneto* has, without serious challenge from the Spanish ecclesiastical authorities or theologians[30] and hence assumedly with their approval, played a significant role in Spanish (and Hispano-American) catechesis and devotional life. My colleague, Dr. David Rubio, tells me that it is still used widely today in Spain as part of popular devotion, and is commonly required to be committed to memory by Catholic children of high school age. Pfandl reports that in present-day Spain it is used by great numbers of all classes as their favorite prayer from the cradle to the grave.[31] Here is the literal translation of the *Soneto a Cristo crucificado*, in which the meaning is scrupulously preserved, but in which the superb beauty of this great masterpiece of Spanish literature is largely lost:

It is not heaven which thou has promised me that moves me to love Thee, my God; nor is it hell so dreaded that moves me to refrain from offending Thee.

It is Thou who movest me, Lord; seeing Thee nailed on this cross and scoffed at moves me; seeing Thy body so wounded moves me; Thy insults and Thy death move me.

Thou movest me to Thy love in such manner that though heaven were not, I would love Thee, and though hell were not, I would fear Thee.

Thou dost not have to give in order that I should love Thee; for though all I hope for, I were not hoping for, I would still love Thee the same as I do love Thee.

---

operibus cit.; on earliest date of 1628, cf. Zarco, *loc. cit.*, pp. 130 f. These conclusions agreed to by: *Mon. xav, loc. cit.*, II, 1006 f.; Pfandl, *loc. cit.*, p. 148; Peers, *loc. cit.*, I, 202 f.; Hurtado and Palencia, *loc. cit.*, I, 433 ff.

[30] The Bavarian theologian, Eusebius Amort, *loc. cit.*, IV, 68, considered the Latin version, *O, Deus, ego amo Te*, as positively excluding the desire for beatitude, and hence, as in so far objectionable, but absolved the other Latin version, *Ut Te colam, Deus meus*, of any charge. His strictures do not refer to the Spanish original. See also on this point, *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXIII, 1 (July 1945), 60.

[31] Pfandl, *loc. cit.*, p. 149.

As representative of the great scholastic revival of the century following the close of the Council of Trent, to about 1660, may be cited St. Francis de Sales (†1622), Lessius (†1623) and Sylvius (†1649).

Love of desire is that by which we love something for the profit we aspire to from it; love of benevolence is that by which we love something for its own good, for what else is it to have love of benevolence for a person than to wish him good?[32]

When we fear to offend God, not to avoid the suffering of hell or the loss of Paradise, but solely because God being our good Father we owe Him honor, respect and obedience, then our fear is filial; just as a well-born child does not obey his father because the latter has power to punish him for disobedience, nor because he can disinherit him, but simply because he is his father; so that even if his father should be old, powerless and poor, he would not cease to serve him with equal diligence, but, like the pious stork, would help him with all the more care and affection . . . Those then fear God with filial affection who fear to displease Him purely and simply because He is their most sweet, most benign and most lovable Father. Nevertheless, when this filial fear happens to be joined, mixed and diluted with servile fear of eternal damnation or with mercenary fear of losing Paradise, it does not cease to be very agreeable to God, and is called initial fear, that is to say, fear of apprentices who are just beginning the exercises of divine love.[33]

Love of desire is that by which we love God for ourselves, desiring to enjoy Him to our own profit *(cupientes eo frui in nostrum commodum)* . . . Love of friendship is the affection by which we desire all intrinsic and extrinsic good to God, without any consideration of our own profit *(nulla commodi nostri habita ratione)*, but solely that it may be well with Him *(sed solum vt ipsi Deo bene sit)*.[34]

To love is nothing else than to wish good to another in order that it may be well with him *(ut ipsi bene sit)*.[35]

The love of friendship is that by which we love a person on his own account and will good to him for his own sake, and not for our own profit *(non propter nostrum proprium commodum)*.[36]

---

[32] St. Francis de Sales, *Traitté de l'amour de Dieu*, livre 1, ch. 13, in *Oeuvres* (Annecy, 1894), IV, 70 f.

[33] *Ibid.*, livre 11, ch. 18, V, 304 f.

[34] L. Lessius, *De summo bono et aeterna beatitudine hominis libri quattuor*, in *Opuscula* (Antwerp, 1626), lib. 2, c. 5, p. 521.

[35] *Ibid.*, c. 6, p. 523.

[36] F. Sylvius, *Commentarius* in I-II, q. 26, a. 4, (Duaci, 1635), II, 228.

It is not permitted so to love God on account of the reward that eternal life is constituted the entirely final end of our love or that we so love Him for the reward that otherwise we would not love Him . . . Since God is supremely good and supremely lovable for His own sake, we should love Him for His own sake even though no profit were to accrue to us *(etiam dato quod nihil nobis commodi proueniret)* from love of Him. Therefore God should be loved on account of eternal reward in the sense that we indeed practise both love and other good works on account of beatitude as the end of these works, but that we further order this our beatitude to God as to our absolutely final end *(in finem simpliciter vltimum)*, being so disposed that even if beatitude were not to be expected *(ita affecti vt etiamsi non esset expectanda beatitudo)* we should nevertheless will to love Him just the same and to do other good works for His sake. In this manner we shall be loving God principally and for His own sake, and will be looking to our eternal reward secondarily and for the sake of God and the glory of God.[37]

Charity is principally love of benevolence; nevertheless there is nothing to forbid its including secondarily some love of desire: for true friendship does not exclude regard for some good to be attained from a friend, provided that the friend is loved primarily and principally for his own sake, and that the good accruing is looked to only secondarily . . . Although therefore charity in itself *(secundum se)* and in the sense of love of friendship does not look to reward but wills good to God without regard to any recompense *(non spectet praemium, sed velit bonum Deo sine intuitu alicuius retributionis)*, nevertheless this does not prevent the same charity from wishing by love of desire to possess and see God, since it [charity] refers this its possession and vision likewise to the glory of God.[38]

He [God] should so be loved that He would still be loved even though we expected no reward *(sic oportet eum diligere, quod etiam diligeretur quamuis nullam mercedem expectaremus)*.[39]

For the eighteenth century we may quote St. Alphonsus Liguori (†1787). In his popular explanation of the faith, intended for the use and guidance of pastors, missionaries and all ecclesiastics engaged in teaching Christian doctrine, in speaking of charity, he says:

[37] *Ibid.*, *in II-II*, q. 27, a. 3 (Duaci, 1628), III, 171 f.

[38] *Ibid.*, ad 1., III, 172.

[39] *Ibid.*, ad 5., III, 172.

Thus the motive of loving God is His infinite goodness, for which [goodness] He deserves to be loved for His own sake, even though there were neither reward for the one who loves Him, nor punishment for the one who does not love Him *(ancorchè non vi fosse nè premio per chi l'ama, nè castigo per chi non l'ama).*[40]

The more recent theologians, of the last hundred years, commonly use hypothetical statements, such as, "if there were no hell, I would (or would not) have the will to sin," in explaining the difference between simple servile fear and formally servile fear,[41] but do not as a rule use the hypothetical form, as we have seen it used from St. Augustine to St. Alphonsus Liguori, to explain perfect love or contrition. There are, however, exceptions. Thus Pohle:

The Church proclaims to all her children that pure love of God is the first and supreme commandment (cf. Mark, xii, 30). It is our highest ideal to act out of love. For he who truly loves God would keep His commandments, even though there were no eternal reward in the next life. Nevertheless, the desire for heaven is a necessary and natural consequence of the perfect love of God; for heaven is only the perfect possession of God by love. As a true friend desires to see his friend without thereby sinking into egotism so does the loving soul ardently desire the Beatific Vision, not from a craving for reward, but out of pure love.[42]

The patristic and scholastic evidence presented in the preceding several pages is representative only. It could easily be multiplied. Discussion of each passage in the light of its context and against the background of the total concept of love as held by each writer quoted would be *de rigueur* were the present paper intended as an exhaustive monograph. The sense of the quotations, however, seems sufficiently clear for our purpose, and the present writer has encountered nothing in the contexts of the quotations or in the

[40] St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Istruzione al popolo . . . per uso de' parrochi e missionari e di tutti gli ecclesiastici che s'impiegano ad insegnare la dottrine christiana*, parte 1, c. 1, sect. 3, n. 25, in *Opere* (Torino, 1861), IX, 908.

[41] Cf., *e.g.*, Palmieri, *loc. cit.* (footnote 2 *supra*), 341 f., 352-58; Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1938), I, 635 f.; 2nd ed. (1936), III, 439 f., 445 ff.

[42] J. Pohle, art. "*Merit*," in *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1911), X, 205. See also Deharbe, *loc. cit.* (footnote 1 *supra*), pp. 164 f., 182, 234; Palmieri, *loc. cit.*, pp. 259, 266.

total concepts of love as held by the several authorities cited that would change or contradict this clear sense.

From the evidence presented, patristic and scholastic tradition seems clearly and consistently to hold that an act of perfect love is one by which we love God unselfishly and disinterestedly, for His own sake, not in view of the reward we shall receive from Him for loving Him; although, as the same tradition holds, the person who makes such an act may and should at the same time desire by hope and imperfect love to receive such reward. The evidence cited indicates further that the hypothetical explanation of such perfect love—that is, the person making the act is so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward for doing it or punishment for not doing it: *homo habens caritatem etiam operaretur si nulla retributio sequeretur*, as St. Thomas tersely put it—occurs equally clearly and consistently in patristic and scholastic tradition from St. Augustine to the present day.

After all, if I say that I love a person "for his own sake," I mean, unless I am merely playing with words, that I love him, principally and dominantly at least, for the good I will to him or do him, not for the personal advantage or good or profit that I may expect or hope to receive from him. Otherwise I am loving him, principally and dominantly at least, for my own sake, not for his sake. And, if I love him, for his own sake and not for such expected profit or reward, I should love him even though I were to expect no profit or reward from him. This simple parallel reasoning is fairly explicit in some of the quotations we have given such as those from St. Bonaventure, Blessed Juan de Avila and St. Francis de Sales, and is implicit in many of the others.

If then, to continue, a person making an act of perfect love or perfect contrition should be so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward for doing it or punishment for not doing it, we are amply justified in concluding, in fact are logically compelled to conclude, that an act of love or contrition is perfect only if the person making it is so disposed that he would do God's will even if there were no reward for doing it and no punishment for not doing it. There is nothing "heroic" or "extravagant," let alone quietistic, about this. It follows with rigorous logic from the essential concept of perfect love as held and explained traditionally in patristic and scholastic teaching.

So much for the theological aspect of the problem. We turn now to some of the pastoral and pedagogical aspects of it.

Among the central doctrines of the Church that have to be taught by parish priests and classroom teachers, none is more important than that concerning love of God, including the distinction between perfect love, imperfect love, and formally servile fear; and, many of us feel, none is more difficult to explain with such clarity, precision, fullness, and orthodoxy that all our parishioners and pupils will have a firm and true grasp of it.

The doctrine is supremely important. It concerns, not merely this or that particular phase of the Catholic moral ideal, but the very heart thereof, "the whole law and the prophets," the central all-embracing precept of love with its two great levels.

Teaching the doctrine properly is extraordinarily difficult. The doctrine itself, very simple from one standpoint, is in reality extremely complex, especially as regards the precise difference between perfect love, imperfect love, and formally servile or mercenary fear. Furthermore, our parishioners and students have each to be helped to understand how far he or she measures up to or falls short of the ideal of love. The attainment of such an understanding entails a good deal of introspective appraisal of his or her motives, not an easy task even for those experienced or trained in introspection, let alone for the great proportion of adults and young people with little or no experience or training therein.

What is the best method to follow in the pastoral and academic presentation of the Catholic doctrine of love of God? There is no unanimity of experience, of practice, or of view among parish priests or class room teachers. Each method of presentation has its advantages and its weaknesses. Each method incurs some risk of misunderstanding or of lack of understanding. The only way to avoid all risk of misunderstanding is not to teach the subject at all!

The present writer has, for the last two or three decades, made use of the hypothetical question as a helpful auxiliary pedagogical device in teaching the concept of love of God to Catholic college students. Whether, or in how far, the use of this device would be helpful with children of the lower elementary grades, he would not venture to assert, as he had not tried it out in class when he used to teach these grades. On the college level, however, he feels

from experience that the device is decidedly helpful, first in conveying a better understanding of what love in general and perfect love in particular mean, secondly in helping students to appraise their own motivation more accurately, and thirdly in assisting them toward attainment of or closer approximation to perfect love as their dominant motive, as well as toward avoidance of the lethal hazard of dropping to the level of formally servile fear.

The technical theological terminology, love of God "on account of His infinite perfections," is highly abstract, and hence neither easily understood in its real meaning nor easily applied to one's own self as a measure of self-appraisal of motivation. "Do you love God on account of His infinite perfections?" is, for most of us, the writer believes, a much more difficult question to answer than, "Would you love Him and try to do your best for Him even if there were no reward or punishment from Him?" The average young person—or older one—if he asks himself, "Do I love my parents (or my best friends) on account of their good qualities (their 'perfections')?" may well find the question a hard one to answer. He had not analyzed the ultimate motives, unselfish or self-regarding, of his love *in these terms*, even though he may actually have the most unselfish love for them. But if he asked himself, "Would I love my parents and do my best to help them, even though I could no longer expect benefits from them?" he could more easily answer. And the answer, if affirmative, would indicate a love that is principally and dominantly unselfish, an unselfish love either of benevolence or of gratitude or of both.

This practical approach appears appreciably more clarifying in the matter both of concept and of self-appraisal with our American Catholic college students than does the more abstract "metaphysical" one, "on account of His infinite perfections." Furthermore, the present writer has found that with this practical approach students who otherwise had given little or no thought to attaining perfect love, because as abstractly presented—love of God "on account of His infinite perfections"—it had been considered by them as quite beyond their spiritual capacities, can readily be interested and stimulated to aspire toward and reach it as their dominant motive for doing God's will.

The supposed hazard of quietistic misunderstanding by students has, so far as the present writer's experience goes, been zero. The problem is very simply met in advance by explaining in clear

words that one who has perfect love may and should also want to go to heaven and to escape hell. A more actual problem is the following: an occasional student, on first hearing the hypothetical question, may be a bit perplexed, chiefly through confusion of the two meanings of "I would" in our English conditional—"I would" as expressing efficacious will, and "I would" as expressing intellectual prediction. The same problem may arise when explaining the difference between imperfect contrition and formally servile fear. But a little classroom or private discussion in practically all cases readily clears up the confusion.

There is no perfect pedagogical method of explaining perfect and imperfect love and formally slavish fear. All that the present writer can claim, from many years of classroom exposition and free discussion, of consultations with individual students outside of class hours, and of analysis of students' answers given in tests and term exams, is that he has found the approach to the concept of love by way of the hypothetical question a useful *auxiliary* device. He fervently hopes that some day some pedagogical genius will discover and give us the perfect method. We can, however, be sure in advance that, even if discovered, it will not be an easy one for parish priest or classroom teacher to use. Teaching with limpid clarity the complex Catholic doctrine of love and its levels will always be a supreme challenge to the re-resourcefulness and skill of the parish priest and of the classroom teacher.

May we add one further pedagogical suggestion? In parish and classroom we are not dealing with a highly selected spiritual élite. We are dealing with unselected average groups. The imperfect motives of desire of reward and fear of punishment have to be given their proper emphasis, as Our Lord and the Church give them. On the other hand, we have to maintain due proportion and balance between perfect and imperfect love, adopting our instruction in each case to our given hearers. To stop short at the imperfect motives, to give them exclusive or near-exclusive emphasis is to depart from the ideal of Our Lord, "be ye perfect," and of the Church. And a great many present-day parish priests and classroom teachers as well as theologians and spiritual directors are decidedly of the opinion that for a long time past the emphasis on the imperfect motives has gone relatively too far, or, to put it a little more precisely, that there has been notably

too little emphasis on unselfish and disinterested love of God.

The marked egoistic individualism of our modern Occidental culture has apparently made serious inroads into Catholic spiritual life. The Catholic laity themselves in growing numbers, youth as well as adults, are sharply challenging this egoism, and are asking, "Why do we not hear more, in church and classroom, of unselfishness towards God and man? More of what we can give to God and man, not solely of what we can get from them?" There is no touch of quietism in their question or in their lives. There is a generous measure of the unselfish.

Most Catholics, practically all perhaps, even the average or sub-average ones, do many single deeds of devotion, sacrifice or charity unselfishly for God's sake. They are far from indifferent to divine reward, but they do not haggle, as it were, with God for every single good deed they do—for every rosary they say, every visit they make to the Blessed Sacrament, every little Lenten sacrifice, every cup of cold water they give in His name. Further, many of our children and adults, certainly an appreciable minority at least, already have perfect love of God as the dominant motive of their lives. Many more could easily be encouraged to rise to this high level. They need encouragement from priests and teachers, all the encouragement we can give them.

One final point in conclusion—a plea to our theologians. We have no satisfactory orderly theological treatment in English of Catholic teaching regarding perfect and imperfect love of God and formally servile fear—none that is satisfactory in the sense of meeting the needs of our thousands of religion teachers.[43] Such a treatment, of, say, about two hundred or even one hundred pages in length, expressed in everyday English with a minimum of technical theological terminology but formulating concisely and exactly and explaining and illustrating clearly the Catholic doctrine of love as found in our scriptural, patristic and scholastic sources, would be an invaluable gift to our religion teachers.

In their name we extend the plea a little farther. Three basic Catholic approaches emphasizing the unselfish in our Catholic ideals are happily receiving increasing attention. These are the familial, the liturgical, and the amical. Each of these three is

[43] The treatise of St. Francis de Sales on the love of God is somewhat too diffuse for our purpose. F. Rouvier, *The Conquest of Heaven*, tr. (Baltimore, 1924), and H. C. Semple, *Heaven Open to Souls*, (New York, 1916), are too loose.

built up from rich clusters of dogmas. The first two were urged by Pius XI in the cause of greater charity and justice, as he looked forward to the time "when all sections of society [would] have the intimate conviction that they are members of a single family and children of the same Heavenly Father, and further, that they are 'one body in Christ and everyone members one of another.' "[44] The third, with emphasis on the concept of love of God as love of friendship, and of our Lord as the Divine Friend uniting all men in one friendship circle, also has great promise from the teaching standpoint, but to date has not been used much by our religion teachers.

We now have excellent treatments in English on the liturgical approach and the Mystical Body, treatments beautifully fulfilling the requirements mentioned above. We have no like treatments in English of the Fatherhood of God and the great-human-family concept, or of love as friendship and the friendship-circle concept.[45] May we enter a plea to our theologians for such, preferably written in co-operation with parish priests and religion teachers. The service so rendered would do incalculable good in the supreme cause to which theology, pastoral care, and religious education are alike dedicated.

JOHN M. COOPER

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[44] Pius XI, *Quadragesimo anno.*

[45] The concept of perfect love as divine friendship, as first given adequate and systematic treatment by St. Thomas Aquinas, has been splendidly presented by: J. M. Keller, *De virtute caritatis ut amicitia quadam divina*, in *Xenia thomistica* (Rome, 1925), II, 233-76; and R. Egenter, *Gottesfreundschaft: Die Lehre von der Gottesfreundschaft in der Scholastik und Mystik des 12. u. 13. Jahrhunderts* (Augsburg, 1928). Cf. also the excellent short article by J. Schneider, "Charity, Divine Friendship, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CIV, 6 (June 1941), 481-91. Egenter's study, while in some respects the more comprehensive, is less adapted to the needs of religion teachers than is Keller's. A treatment in English, longer than Schneider's and along the lines of Keller's, with fuller exploitation of the scriptural, scholastic and mystical sources, and with more explicit attention to the related concept of the friendship circle centering around Christ, would be eminently desirable. Investigation of patristic and scholastic commentaries and homilies on *John* 15:15 ("I have called you friends") and similar NT and OT texts would perhaps serve as a good start toward working out a fuller formulation of the friendship-circle concept. The present writer has encountered no thorough systematic theological treatment of the friendship-circle concept.

RELEASED TIME FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Part II

IV. OPPONENTS AND PROPONENTS OF RELEASED TIME

The Released Time plan for religious education during the comparatively brief period of its existence has won wide approval and encouragement, at times reserved and qualified, from educators and churchmen; but it has also aroused from these same quarters and from other voices, opposition which is strong and influential. The objections against the program are presented in the following fairly representative argument:

> The movement has been meeting with strong opposition from educational bodies, some important parent and teacher organizations, progressive educators, and others. . . . Basic is their [the opposition's] contention that the operation of released time represents a sectarian intrusion into the public schools. They hold such features as the recording and checking of attendance by the public schools, the supervision exercised by public school teachers, and the practice prevailing in some communities of holding classes for religious instruction within public school buildings, to be direct infringements upon the freedom of the public schools from church influence. Moreover, while appreciating the importance of impressing spiritual and religious values upon the youth of the nation, they contend that church schools are denominational in character, giving chiefly sectarian instruction with which the public schools should have no active concern.
>
> Opponents of the movement also believe that it will prove to be the forerunner of more serious efforts to introduce sectarian dogmas into the state systems of education. Similarly, they are fearful of attempts to introduce religious instruction directly into the curriculum of the public schools, and of the agitation by the Catholic Church to secure public funds for its parochial schools. The released time plan, they maintain, will prove the entering wedge for procedures endangering the existence of our free non-sectarian public schools by violating the fundamental American principle of the separation of church and state.[1]

In 1940, Governor Lehman of New York briefly refuted the chief objections of opponents of Released Time in a memorandum

[1] Morris Fine, *Contemporary Jewish Review*, Feb., 1941.

submitted at the signing of the Goudert-McLaughlin Bill. "A few people have given voice to fears that the bill violates principles of our Government. These fears, in my opinion, are groundless. The bill does not introduce anything new into our public school system nor does it violate the principles of our public educational system .... The Court of Appeals pointed out, 'Neither the Constitution nor the law discriminates against religion. Denominational religion is merely put in its proper place outside of public aid or support.' "[2]

Released Time was condemned by the writer of an article which appeared in the Aug. 1945 issue of *Chicago's Schools*, a publication of the Citizens' School Committee; it was reprinted in the *Scottish Rite News Bulletin* of Oct. 20, 1945. The writer's main objections to the Released Time program are that it violates the principle of separation of church and state, it reduces school time necessary for efficient operation of an already loaded curriculum, and it leads to discrimination in treatment of pupils of different racial and religious beliefs or it penalizes those with no religious preference. The second point is expressed as follows:

> From the standpoint of the school which has, at the most, less than a fifth of the waking hours of any child; released time reduces the hours for a crowded curriculum. It makes school programming difficult, and especially so where different churches or different groups have classes at separate times. Our schools are seriously in need of protection from awkward interruptions.[3]

Criticism of Released Time on similar grounds was voiced in two editorials printed in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* of June 8 and June 11, 1945. It was inferred that the progress of public school children was retarded in some degree at least because some of the pupils spend one hour weekly in the study of religion. A denial of this allegation was made by the chairman of the St. Louis chapter of the Knights of Columbus in a letter to the publisher of the *Post-Dispatch*. It was pointed out that pupils attending private schools conducted under Catholic, Lutheran, and Jewish auspices devote more than one hour per week to religious education and

[2] Most Rev. William A. Scully, "The Present Status of Released Time in New York," *Proceedings of National Confraternity Congress* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1941), p. 57.

[3] "Religion on School Time," *Scottish Rite News Bulletin*, Oct. 20, 1945, p. 1.

yet these pupils compare favorably in educational outcomes with pupils of the public schools.[4]

The question of discrimination, as Erwin L. Shaver points out, has been raised on occasion by opponents of the Released Time.

> To some it seems that the plan is divisive and therefore sectarian in the basic meaning of the term. This accusation springs from the fact that children of several faiths or sometimes of several denominations go to separate places for instruction, or that children whose parents do not request their excusal for this purpose are left in the public school classroom and are thereby put in an unfavorable light. This is almost entirely a theoretical objection. Some of the very persons and groups who raise the objection have for generations requested and have been granted the excusal of their children for church holy days and festivals or for catechetical instruction. One of the remarkable things about the plan is its pattern and practice of interdenominational and inter-faith planning, organizing and teaching.[5]

Discrimination involving particular groups was not found to be present in eighty-eight New York City public schools that operated on Released Time, according to a Report of the Public School Association entitled, "Released Time for Religious Education in New York City's Schools." The number of children released in the schools visited was as follows: Catholic, 27,826; Protestant, 3,715; Jewish, 1,444. The Public School Association, which sponsored the Report, is opposed to the Released Time plan for the reason that "the law permitting the release of public school children during school hours for the purpose of religious instruction is ill-advised. At the same time, the Association continues to recognize the importance of religious training in the lives of children but steadfastly maintains that this training, to be effective, must be the responsibility of home and church."[6] The subcommittee that made the survey as objectively as possible concluded as follows:

> During the past year there has been a rise of one per cent in the total number of children released from the 88 schools visited. The number

---

[4] News release, *Denver Register*, July, 1945.

[5] The Movement for Weekday Religious Education," *Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb., 1946, p. 12.

[6] *Released Time for Religious Education in New York City's Schools*, (New York: Public Educational Association, June 30, 1945), p. 4.

of Catholic and Jewish children has increased slightly and the Protestants have decreased, though percentages of the numbers of each faith remained fairly static.

The administrative machinery of the schools is demonstrating its efficiency in the simplification of record keeping and the saving of staff time in the released time program. . . . Dismissal proceeds so easily in most schools that there are fewer indications of the center to which each child goes. The program has become routine; teachers know which pupils are to leave and the children proceed purposefully to their assembled groups or to other destinations. There was decidedly less interruption of classroom activity noted in the 1945 reports. The re-adjustment now seems to be customary and causes little disturbance.[7]

A representative Jewish spokesman has recently declared that fears of discrimination in operating the Released Time program are groundless. "It should be stated in all fairness that some of the fears regarding released time have not materialized, at least in New York. It has not proved to be a divisive influence in the public school; there have been no reports of embarrassment of Jewish children who get up from their seats in the public school once each week to go to their religious school. Indeed, this is no longer a reason for opposing released time."[8]

Dr. Fleming, in his provocative book *God in Our Public Schools*, is opposed to the Released Time plan because it does not go far enough in solving the problem of presenting religion to all children of the public schools:

It cannot solve the nation's moral and religious problem, that of making good citizens of the two-thirds of the children that never darken church doors. The plan must depend upon voluntary attendance, and it is folly to think that those who will not go to church school on Sunday will go on Friday. . . . Thus, say what its advocates will, these schools can in the main give only a little more religious training to those who in Sunday school already receive some, while leaving untouched the vast throngs that need it most—those from whom come the problem child and criminal adult.[9]

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[8] Ben M. Edidin, "Released Time in the Jewish Community," *Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb., 1946, p. 29.

[9] W. S. Fleming, D. D., *God in Our Public Schools*, with Introduction by Luther A. Weigle, 2nd ed. (Pittsburg, Pa.: the National Reform Association, 1944), p. 81.

This writer reports a claim made by leaders of the Released Time program that their schools have reached an enrollment of approximately one million pupils. "On this basis," asserts Dr. Fleming, "these Released Time church schools are today reaching with some religious instruction one out of 30 of American youth of public school age, one of 64 of the 16,000,000 unreached by any church." He admits, however, that the plan is reaching with religious instruction a small proportion of American youth who greatly need it, but chiefly it is a preparation for the ultimate solution to the entire problem, which he affirms, is that "of giving non-sectarian religious instruction in the public schools as an integral part of our system of public education, by teachers qualified to give it and employed and paid by the state."[10]

Favorable opinion for the Released Time program from the viewpoint of an educator is voiced by Professor McKibbin in the authoritative publication *Education*. "Many of the factors that led to the inauguration of this movement are today bringing renewed interest in it." Mr. McKibbin lists the advantages as follows:

> The inadequacy and limitation of Sunday school instruction, the failure of the home to provide sufficient religious nurture, the over-secularization of public education, the desire to bring religion closer to the everyday education of children, the large number of unchurched children who it is felt can be reached in the week time. In addition to these factors, there is today an increasing conviction that the total resources of the community, homes, churches, schools, social agencies, can and must be brought to bear more effectively and co-operatively upon the character training of the rising generation, that only thus can the right type of citizen be developed, only thus can we cope successfully with the problem of growing juvenile delinquency. Weekday religious education is one form of experimental co-operation between home, school, and church.[11]

Professor Floyd S. Gove briefly summarized the claims of proponents of plans involving the use of public school time as follows:

1. To make religious instruction an integral part of education.
2. To provide possibility of religious instruction for all children.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[11] Frank M. McKibbin, "Trends in Weekday Religious Education," *Religious Education*, May, 1944, p. 526.

3. To provide more time for religious instruction.
4. To insure frequency and continuity of instruction.
5. To maintain higher academic standards.
6. To give a new importance to religious education in the minds of pupils, parents, and the community as a whole.
7. To secure better distribution of agencies.
8. To remove all semblance of religious instruction from the public schools.
9. To enable Catholics to take children for religious instruction without shouldering the burden of double taxation for secular education.
10. To enable the Jews to conduct their schools under more favorable conditions.[12]

One finds divided opinion regarding Released Time among Protestant spokesmen as well as among members of the Catholic and Jewish faiths. The fact, however, that the plan is operating on a fairly wide scale and has been tested by experience in so many communities indicates a certain recognition of its value on the part of educational and religious leaders of all faiths. The reservations and limited approval given the Released Time plan by different authorities should serve to challenge the proponents of the plan to develop and improve its practical working so as to render if possible all such objections groundless. The following statement, for example, was made by the Protestant member of a Symposium, "Released Time in New York City."

The whole program falls far short of two of its main objectives. It is not reaching a large percentage of unchurched children; it does not make religious education an integral part of general education. But it does afford children additional opportunity for the systematic study of the Bible and other parts of their religious heritage. Many children comment with wonder on the fact that all the fragmentary stories they have heard "fit together." They say that now they like Sunday school better and that they like to go to church, for now they understand better what the teacher and minister are talking about. Public school principals and teachers report greatly increased interest in Bible readings in assembly.

There is more careful planning and supervision than is now found in the average Sunday school and on the whole the level of teaching

---

[12] *Religious Education on Public School Time*, (Harvard University, 1926), p. 19.

is good. This and the fact that it is given time on their regular public school education program gives released time education a dignity and standing in the minds of children. Although the part time may be far distant in New York when religion will be a part of every child's public school education, the number of those already reached is sufficient to challenge us to make the best possible use of the present opportunity.[13]

V. CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES ON RELEASED TIME

The Catholic position in favor of a workable plan to provide religious instruction for public school pupils may be stated in the words of Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore and Washington. In a message to public school teachers which was published in *The Pilot*, biennial publication of the Elementary Classroom Teachers' Association of the District of Columbia, Archbishop Curley said that religious instruction cannot be given through purely secular subjects. The present situation, "is not healthy for our great nation and I am afraid that it is increasing instead of diminishing as the years go on." The Archbishop wrote, "I am convinced that all of us, regardless of Faith, should come together to work out a plan whereby the children of our elementary as well as of our secondary schools, will be given an opportunity to get some religious instruction outside the school in their nearby respective churches, a plan that is being carried out now in a great number of our American cities and states."[14]

In a booklet entitled *The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine*, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, writes as follows:

> The Confraternity advocates the extension of Released Time religion classes. In many states, Massachusetts is one of them, provision is made whereby the School Committee of the various cities and towns may authorize the school masters to release children for one hour each week, during school hours, to attend religious instruction classes conducted by the various churches. Invariably where Released Time has been put into effect the numbers enrolled have been very much higher than the numbers enrolled in the regular Sunday classes.[15]

---

[13] Imogene M. McPherson, "The Protestant Program of Teaching," *Released Time in New York City, Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb., 1943, p. 22.

[14] *The Pilot*, Jan., 1945, p. 1.

[15] Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D.D., *The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine*, (Boston, 1946). p. 37.

The Catholic Church makes use of the Released Time program because it is her purpose to use proved and practical means of teaching religion to her children who would otherwise be deprived of such instruction. Children should receive an education that includes religious training as well as instruction in the secular branches. This is the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church and her centuries-old legislation fully supports this principle. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866) reflected the concern and solicitude of the Church for the spiritual training of children whose education in the public schools left no place for religious teaching. The Bishops of this Council strongly urged the erection and efficient administration of Catholic parochial schools, and at the same time recognized those practical problems which to a certain extent exist at the present time. "Since exclusively Catholic schools cannot be maintained in all parishes because of the difficult conditions which prevail," the Council urged that necessary precautions be taken to avoid spiritual detriment to Catholic children attending public schools. "To this end let catechetical instructions and schools in Christian doctrine be established. The pastors shall gather the children in their own parishes on Sundays and on other holydays and at times even oftener in order to instruct them zealously and diligently in the elements of Christian doctrine." The Council held up the example of St. Charles Borromeo and his great catechetical work for the children and youth of Milan who had been deprived of formal religious instruction.[16]

Provision for religious instruction of Catholic children attending public schools were similarly made by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884),[17] and a few years later further suggestions were made on the same subject at a meeting of the Archbishops of the United States in New York on Nov. 16, 1892. Monsignor (later Cardinal) Satolli, acting as representative of Pope Leo XIII, presented fourteen propositions based upon and related to the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore bearing upon the religious instruction of Catholic children. The following propo-

[16] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II, Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1894), n. 435, p. 222.

[17] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis III, Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1896), n. 196, p. 100; n. 217, p. 119.

sition (number 12) is notable in that it calls attention to the problem of providing for the religious education of Catholic children attending public schools, and it suggests two plans which bear resemblance to the present plan for weekday religious instruction operating either in public school buildings or outside them.

As for those children that, in great number, are educated in the public schools, where now, not without danger, they receive no religious instruction at all, strenuous efforts should be made not to leave them without sufficient and seasonable instruction in Catholic faith and practice. We know by experience that not all our Catholic children are found in our Catholic schools. Statistics show that hundreds of thousands of Catholic children in the United States of America attend schools which are under the control of State boards, and in which, for that reason, teachers of every denomination are engaged. Beyond all doubt, the one thing necessary, i.e., religious and moral education, according to Catholic principles, is not to be treated either lightly or with delay, but on the contrary, with all earnestness and energy.

The adoption of one of three plans is recommended, the choice to be made according to local circumstances in the different States and various personal relations.

The first consists in an agreement between the bishop and members of the school board, whereby they, in a spirit of fairness and good will, allow the Catholic children to be assembled, during free time, and taught catechism; it would also be of the greatest advantage if this plan were not confined to the primary schools, but were extended likewise to the high schools and colleges, in the form of a free lecture.

The second: To have a catechism class outside the public school building and also classes of higher Christian Doctrine, where, at fixed times, the Catholic children would assemble with diligence and pleasure, induced thereto by the authority of their parents, the persuasion of their pastors, and the hope of praise and rewards.

The third plan does not seem at first sight so suitable, but it is bound up more intimately with the duty of both parents and pastors. Pastors should unceasingly urge upon parents the most important duty, imposed by natural and divine law, of bringing up their children in sound morality and Catholic faith.[18]

---

[18] Most Rev. Francis Satolli, *Ad scholasticam quaestionem dirimendam, et educationem religiosam impertiendam* (New York, 1892), pp. 8 f. English translation: Francesco Satolli, *For the Settling of the School Question and the Giving of Religious Education* (Baltimore, 1892).

The closing recommendation of Monsignor Satolli bears upon the employment of lay teachers in the conduct of religious classes for public school children.

> Nor let him [the pastor] show less love for the children that attend the public schools than for those that attend the parochial schools; on the contrary, stronger marks of loving solicitude are to be shown them; the Sunday school and the hour for catechism should be devoted to them in a special manner. And to cultivate this field, let the pastor call to his aid other priests, religious, and even suitable members of the laity, in order that what is supremely necessary be wanting to no child.

This concern of the Church for the formal religious training of Catholic children who attend public schools is repeatedly expressed in official documents emanating from the Holy See. Such for example are the Encyclical Letter of Pius X, *Acerbo nimis* (On the Teaching of Christian Doctrine) which appeared on April 15, 1905, and the Decree *Provido sane consilio* of the Sacred Congregation of the Council "On the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Instruction" of Jan. 12, 1935. In the former document, Pius X wrote: "Let classes in religion be organized to instruct in the truths of faith and in the practice of Christian life the youths who attend the public schools from which all religious teaching is banned."[19] The latter Decree provides as follows:

> A special series of lessons in religion should be instituted for the better and more advanced instruction of those who teach Christian doctrine in parish and in public schools. . . . In places where on account of the scarcity of priests the clergy themselves cannot sufficiently perform the work of teaching Christian doctrine, let the Ordinaries take active steps to supply able catechists of both sexes to help the pastors. Let them teach religion in the parochial or in the public school, even in the most remote parts of the parish.[20]

Catholic authorities, therefore, who approve and encourage adoption of Released Time do not propose it as a substitute for the Catholic parochial school or the Catholic high school. It is a supplementary program. Moreover, experience shows that organized religious instruction for Catholic children attending public schools has stimulated attendance at the parochial school. The

[19] *ASS*, XXXVII (1904-1905), 615.

[20] *AAS*, XXVII (1935), 151.

Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, whose establishment is obligatory in every Catholic parish in the world, has long recognized the potential value of the Released Time school. This organization makes use of Sunday Schools, Religious Vacation Schools, and, Weekday Religion Schools which are conducted both on free time and where possible according to the Released Time plan. In one of its official publications, we read the following sober evaluation of the plan.

> Released Time for religion classes is now widely discussed and it is undoubtedly an important element in the solution of this problem in many places. It should be energetically sought in such places. When Released Time is granted, it only sets the stage for the solution because it will be worse than failure if the youth are not met by adequately prepared teachers with a proper program of instruction and with reasonable facilities for carrying out that program.[21]

With these facts in mind, one can appreciate the careful planning which today accompanies the initiation and development of the Released Time program on the part of Diocesan Superintendents of Schools, Diocesan Directors of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and others interested in bringing religious training to the greatest possible number of Catholic youth. In those dioceses where enabling legislation, either state or local, prevails, the plan is under way to a greater or less extent. Many problems and obstacles must be met and are being met in urban centers and rural communities which have their own particular difficulties.

A questionnaire submitted to Diocesan Directors of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in 1941 brought answers from seventy-six Directors, of whom only thirty-eight supplied information on released time. Of these, thirty gave unqualified approval to the Released Time plan, two preferred it on the elementary grade level only, one felt it was advisable in certain places, five others remained non-committal.[22]

More recently Released Time has met with significant approval from Diocesan Directors whose views are based upon a successful

[21] *Religious Instruction of Catholic Students Attending Secular High Schools* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1941), p. 2.

[22] Rev. William A. Franer, *Religious Instruction on Released School Time* (unpublished M. A. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, May, 1942), p. 17.

operation of the plan. Monsignor John C. Clarke of Los Angeles has written as follows:

> The fact that religious instruction is allowed during school hours has impressed upon parents its importance and, from a pedagogical point of view, it has been of assistance in impressing upon the child mind that the learning of the catechism is as important as the study of their secular subjects. This factor, together with a regular catechetical program based on a grade level, has resulted in greater interest on the part of the pupils, with a consequent regular attendance. . . . We are certain that the extension of the Released Time program will reach more Catholic public school children, and will be instrumental in no small way in helping them to understand and put in practice the fundamentals of our faith.[23]

A diocese with 167 parishes and missions in the eastern part of our country has a well-organized program of religious instruction which uses the Released Time plan in 142 units. After four years of experience, a report reveals that approximately forty thousand Catholic pupils attending public schools participated in the classes during 1944-45 under the guidance of more than twelve hundred teachers: priests, Sisters, and lay teachers, in equal numbers. Pupils who were not reached during the year numbered 4,344. More than forty elementary school units reported a one hundred per cent coverage of their students; the same record was found in thirty-five high school units. In a large number of units state or local credit was gained for the course in religion. The over-all figure of children attending Catholic elementary and high schools was slightly over thirty-eight thousand; and accordingly more than forty per cent of the Catholic children of school age in that diocese was cared for in religious schools under the Released Time plan.[24]

VI. THE CURRICULUM CONTENT

The curriculum content adopted in the Released Time programs is left to the various supervisors of the different church centers; for the most part the aim is to impart a definite training

[23] "Released Time—Its Advantages," *Confraternity Notes* (Los Angeles), June, 1945, p. 1.

[24] Files, National Center, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D. C., 1946.

in religion which ordinarily has no part in the public school course of studies, and the various syllabi now in use outline material in keeping with the doctrinal beliefs of the participating faiths together with studied attention to practical application of religious truths and moral principles to daily living and to social and civic betterment.[25]

Catholic centers operating on Released Time for the most part follow a syllabus or manual which is based upon the Catechism and correlated with the Bible and Church History on the elementary level and is graded accordingly. Thus, the *School Year Religious Instruction Manual* drawn up by a special Committee for the National Center of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is widely used in Released Time programs. This series is in three parts and is graded as follows: Grades I-II; III-V; VI-VIII. For purposes of reference a program for the elementary and the high school is here given in part.[26]

COURSE OF INSTRUCTION

Grade	*Subject*	*Emphasis on:*
I.	Prayer	First Prayers, Sacred Stories
II.	First Communion	Preparation for Confession and Communion
III.	Apostles' Creed	The Life of Our Lord
IV.	The Commandments	Commandments of God
V.	The Sacraments	Grace; Sacramentals
VI.	Apostles' Creed and Life of Christ	New Testament
VII.	Commandments	The Commandments, Precepts of Church
VIII.	Sacraments	Sacrifice of the Mass, Church History

Each week's unit of instruction presents: prayer study, Scriptural references, doctrine and practice. The pupil has the text on which the outline is based. In a corresponding manual the instructor has material for lesson development with emphasis on

[25] Cf. "The Protestant Program of Teaching," and "Released Time Program in Jewish Centers," *Religious Education*, Jan.-Feb., 1943, p p. 16-22. Cf. als "The Roman Catholic Program," *ibid.*, pp. 22 ff.

[26] Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Los Angeles, 1944.

practical application. Essentials are repeated frequently with progressive thoroughness to meet age abilities and needs.

Following is an outline for a forty minute lesson, Grade IV; *Reverence for God.*

Date May	Prayer Study Our Father	Lesson Command-ments 1-4	Scripture Moses and the Com-mandments	Project Book God Gave the Commandments
4th week		(Review)	*(Exod.* 3) Lord teach us to pray *(Matt.* 6:9-13)	No man can change them. Everyone must obey them.

Aim: The knowledge of how to reverence God and His home on earth, the Church. (Review by pupils of previous lesson).

Doctrine: God is holy. His name is holy. He wants us to honor Him. Review part of first and second commandments; reverence for God's house and for His name. Catechism questions 89, 90, 98, 99.

Practice: In church, as well as at home and school, God sees me. How will I show my love for Him? (Discuss)

The curriculum content for the high school level is found to consist of more advanced study of the basic subject matter of Christian doctrine together with special attention to moral and social questions and its purpose is to make Christianity a Life to be lived according to the model of Christ.

In some centers the Bible is the main course of study with supplementary material based on and related to the Scriptures. An advantage of this type of course is its recognition for credit by high school authorities where such is the rule. The recent *American Outlines for Bible Study* contains the following descriptive introduction.

This Outline is prepared for a four year high school course in which the Bible is to be studied for its normal, historical, and literary value. The only required text is the Bible. Two courses are offered. Each is outlined for weekly semester hours during two school years, or for daily semester hours during a semester.

Course One—THE OLD TESTAMENT

First Section: The Patriarchs and Judges, from ADAM to DAVID.

Second Section: The Kings and Prophets, from DAVID to CHRIST.

Course Two—THE NEW TESTAMENT

First Section: The Life of CHRIST, from the four Gospels.

Second Section: The Apostolic Church, from the Acts and the Epistles.

The purpose of this Outline, in order to make it generally acceptable, is to stimulate interest in Biblical Education and Practice. It advances an invitation to all Church and religious instruction bodies of the state to teach the Bible with a view to high school credit as provided by the state and authorized by the local Board of Education. It constitutes a contribution toward the better education of our young people.[27]

Each denomination provides for the conduct of its own classes, uses its own version of the Bible, syllabi, handbooks, commentaries and other instructional aids.

VII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of factors which effect the full and successful operation of the Released Time plan. Chief among them is the conduct of religious education classes of high rating and efficiency. This means careful preliminary planning, well-trained teachers, complete curriculum content, and satisfactory physical facilities in the religion center. Trained observers report that there is much room for improvement in the work of the religion centers. The quality of teaching in the religion classes should equal if not excel that which is demanded of the teacher of the secular branches. In the Report of the Public School Association of New York the following observation was made. "It was also recorded in the reports of visitors that principals attributed the rise and fall in attendance to the personalities of those in charge of the center as well as to the program offered." A Report made after inspection of the Released Time plan in the cities of Dayton and Cincinnati concluded as follows:

The effectiveness of the weekday program is directly dependent upon (a) the quality of the teacher personnel and instruction, (b) the provision of effective supervision, (c) close relationship between religious

---

[27] *American Outlines for Bible Study*, edited by Rev. Joseph L. Lilly (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1945), pp. 1 f.

and public school personnel in curriculum, methods of instruction, scheduling, purposes, and standards, (d) the provision of adequate instruction materials, (e) the use of suitable facilities of rooms, furniture, and equipment.[28]

The religion teacher is working under handicaps which can be largely eliminated by a well-organized program of teacher training conducted by the sponsors of the religion centers. Religion is a difficult subject to teach under normal conditions. Given the restrictions of the Released Time classes there is demanded in the religion teacher not only familiarity with her subject but also skill in applying methods and techniques to the teaching of religion. The course should be carefully graded and doctrinally solid as well as properly motivated to insure lively interest and willing attendance of the pupils. The classroom equipment and facilities should approximate those to which the pupils are accustomed in their daily classes. Correct lighting, proper seating, and adequate visual aids must be given careful attention. A distinctively religious appearance of the rooms by appropriate settings is desirable in order to enhance the dignity and esteem of the courses. In a word, as Professor Gove declares, "Stringent provisions are needed to insure that standards obtained in the church school shall be equivalent to those in the public school. Otherwise the public is not assured of the proper use of time 'released,' and the cause of religious education suffers through the failure of poorly planned and inefficiently administered programs."[29]

The public school has the responsibility of carrying out the wishes of the parents whose children it educates. "The liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control" is not to be unreasonably interfered with; for "the child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with its high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."[30] This decision of the United States Supreme Court recognizes the right of parents to control the education of their

[28] Report dated Feb. 20, 1946, in Files, Office of Superintendent of Schools, Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington, Baltimore, Md.

[29] *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

[30] *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510, 69 L. ed. 1070, pp. 534, 535.

children. The public school must avoid violation of any federal and state laws in performing its task; and where classes in religious education are duly requested by parents, the authorities of the public schools co-operate to make such classes possible without directly taking part in such instruction. It is a question, therefore, of co-operation and non-interference on the part of the public school in relation to the Released Time plan whether it operates in public school buildings or in church centers. The church centers on their part have the responsibility to provide religious education on a level of efficiency commensurate with the value of the time allotted to it out of school hours and above all in keeping with the plan of religious training of youth. Pope Pius XI defined a complete education in terms of Christian education, as follows:

> Christian education takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, not with a view of reducing it in any way, but in order to elevate, regulate and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ.[31]

Religion has a definite place in life and its special function in education and character building must not be neglected. A knowledge of God and His revealed teachings are a basic and necessary element of religion, which takes in, moreover, the dignity and destiny of the human soul placed here to work for and merit eternal Life. Individual goodness, social charity, domestic and civic virtues take their form and sanctions from religion. The Released Time plan is an attempt to provide these elements to the pupils attending our public schools. Its proponents have reason to hope that the operation of the Released Time plan will enable the youth of our public schools to grow into citizens fully equipped to serve God and country.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S.S.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[31] *Encyclical Letter, Christian Education of Youth,* (Washington, D. C. N.C.W.C.), p. 28.

Answers to Questions

THE PRIVILEGE OF THE LITTLE OFFICE

Question: If a priest enjoys the privilege of substituting the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin for the Canonical Office in the event of a journey of one hundred miles, how should he settle the following doubts which can arise in the practical application of this privilege?

(1) Can the condition "a journey of one hundred miles" be interpreted to include a round trip of fifty miles each way?

(2) Must the required distance of one hundred miles be traversed in the course of a single day, or could the privilege be used if a priest travelled fifty miles one day and returned home the following day?

(3) Must the "one hundred miles" be interpreted mathematically? If it can be understood morally, what would be the minimum distance to justify the use of the privilege?

Answer: The questioner is probably referring to the privilege which was formerly granted to perpetual members of the Near East Welfare Association, and which is still retained by them, though it is no longer available to new members, whether annual or perpetual. The older members may substitute the Little Office of Our Lady for the Canonical Office of the day when they make a journey of at least one hundred miles *ratione officii* (that is, any business connected with their priesthood). Our opinion as to the interpretation of the privilege in the cases presented by the questioner is as follows:

(1) The "journey of one hundred miles" can signify a round trip, provided the sum of the distances both ways amounts to at least one hundred miles.

(2) The entire journey must be made on one and the same day. This is surely the mind of the Holy See in granting the privilege, as is evident from the statement that the Little Office takes the place of the Office *of the day.*

(3) The "one hundred miles" must be interpreted mathematically, not morally. If the Holy See intended to permit the latter form of interpretation, the privilege would have been expressed

as "about one hundred miles." Furthermore, it is to be noted that the privilege is granted for a journey of "at least one hundred miles," which evidently signifies that one hundred miles, strictly understood, is the very minimum.

POPE PIUS XI AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Question: In the English version of the Encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge*, sent by Pope Pius XI to the German bishops on March 14, 1937, we read: "The believer has an inalienable right to profess his faith and to put it into practice in the manner suited to him." Could not one conclude from this that no matter what religion a person may profess he has a genuine natural right to practice it, without being molested or impeded?

Answer: If Pope Pius XI meant to teach what our questioner concludes from his statement, he certainly departed from traditional Catholic belief and from the clear teaching of his predecessor, Pope Pius IX, who condemned the proposition: "Everyone is free to accept and to profess that religion which, under the guidance of the light of reason, he has judged to be true" (*DB*, 1715). It is incredible that Pope Pius XI intended to teach a doctrine so utterly at variance with Catholic tradition—a doctrine, moreover, which would lead to the strange conclusion that a person has an inalienable right to be wrong.

The only reasonable interpretation of the Pope's words is that he was speaking of the inalienable right of *Catholics* to profess and to practice their faith in the manner suited to their religious needs. It must be remembered that the Pope was denouncing the Nazi government for its restrictions on the Catholic Church, so that it was most natural that he should proclaim the right of the Catholic to practice his religion. It should be remembered, too, that our English word "believer" is not an adequate translation of "Der gläubige mensch," as used in a papal document. This latter phrase is the equivalent of the Latin "fidelis," which in the language of the Church normally means "one who has the Catholic faith." Similarly, the word "Christian," when used in the Church's official statements, does not signify anyone who accepts Christ as his religious leader, as the word does nowadays in our land. A Christian, in the language of the Church, means a Catholic.

COMMUNICATION OF THE FACULTY TO BINATE

Question: While visiting in a diocese where I had no faculties, I was asked by a pastor to binate on Sunday, to take the place of a curate, who had been called to the sickbed of his mother. When I asked the pastor if he intended to obtain from the bishop the faculty for me to binate, he replied that this was not necessary, since the faculty to binate was local rather than personal, so that the very fact that he asked me to substitute for his curate on Sunday morning would confer on me the right to say two Masses, as the curate was ordinarily required to do. Was this solution of the pastor correct?

Answer: The pastor's solution seems to have been correct in the particular case to which the questioner refers, though a complete answer to the problem would require a distinction such as is made by Cappello: "The faculty to binate *granted by the Ordinary of the place* is not a personal privilege, but a remedy for necessity. Hence, if a priest to whom it has been given is unable to celebrate, another priest who takes his place can say Mass twice. On the contrary, the faculty to binate which one procures *by a privilege of the Holy See* is ordinarily personal; hence, it cannot be transferred to another unless this was expressly stipulated in the rescript" (Cappello, *De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n. 733). A similar solution is given by Noldin (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Innsbruck, 1940], III, n. 208, 2).

Evidently these authors are visualizing the case described by the questioner, when the substituting priest has no diocesan faculties, but takes the place of one of the priests of the parish with the authorization of the pastor. Even this last condition could be reasonably presumed in certain circumstances—for example, if the pastor is absent and the request for assistance comes from one of the curates. Furthermore, in our country it is from the Ordinary that priests usually receive the faculty to binate, rather than from the Holy See. It is well to add that the principle here propounded—that the faculty to binate coming from the Ordinary can be considered as communicated to one who substitutes for a priest enjoying this faculty—is by no means applicable to the faculty to hear confessions.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MASS STIPENDS

Question: (1) (a) A priest announces to his parishioners that, after a funeral, all Memorial cards, specifying Low Masses and offered by the parishioners only, will be "bunched" into High Masses, presuming that all his parishioners are present when the announcement is made or that the others will hear about it from those who are present. (b) Other priests have special Memorial cards made for funerals, worded: "The enclosed $..... is my offering *towards* a High Mass for the repose . . . etc."

(2) In our diocese pastors are allowed to offer two Masses "ex justitia" on Sundays and Holydays, the one "*pro populo*" and another for which they are allowed to accept a stipend. Assistants, of course, are allowed to accept two stipends. In each case, however, the extra stipend must be sent in to the Diocese for the crippled children's home. (a) Some pastors have only one Mass on Sunday, a High Mass, so they give the assistant a Low Mass stipend and tell him to offer one of his Low Masses "*pro populo*," keeping the High Mass stipend for themselves. (b) Other pastors have a Low and a High Mass on Sunday. They say a Low Mass "*pro populo*," for which they send a Low Mass stipend in to the Diocese, and sing the High Mass, for which they keep the High Mass stipend.

Are all these practices: first, licit, and, second, considered "trafficking" in Masses? Would the higher cost of living today be considered sufficient reason to excuse any of these practices?

Answer: As for the points mentioned in (1, a), it is to be noted that as many Masses are to be celebrated and applied as stipends, even small ones, have been given and received (Can. 828). It is also to be noted that it is for the bishop to determine the stipend of manual Masses in his diocese by his decree, which, so far as possible, is to be rendered in a Synod; and that a priest is not allowed to demand more than that stipend. If the decree of the bishop has not been given, the custom of the diocese is to be observed (Can. 831, §§1, 2).

Of course, a priest can accept for the application of a Mass a greater stipend spontaneously given; and, unless the bishop has forbidden it, even a smaller one (Can. 832).

In the first set of facts stated in the question it appears that those who have procured the Memorial cards have already given

a stipend, which has been received, for Low Masses. The supposition is that those who have given the stipends for Masses are parishioners who are present or who will hear about the proposal to "bunch" these Low Masses into High Masses.

Presumably when two persons have entered into an agreement as to what one of them shall do they can modify that agreement so that he shall be bound to do something different. Here, however, we see no new agreement. There is merely an announcement by the one bound that he will do something other than he has agreed to do. Unless the other parties to the agreement consent to such a change it would seem that he is merely attempting a unilateral modification, which is of no binding force.

It might be argued that "silence gives consent," but that presupposes that the one who keeps silent could have and should have spoken. In the present case there is room to wonder whether the parishioners can speak under the circumstances. It is certainly not clear that they should speak, for having agreed that the pastor should perform in a particular way this obligation accepted by him they can hardly be required to continue to demand performance according to his promise. That promise was given by him, and is binding until such time as it is performed according to its terms.

It would seem, therefore, under the circumstances set forth in part (1, a) of the question, the pastor cannot simply announce that the Low Masses will be "bunched" into High Masses, for in doing so he would be attempting to change unilaterally the terms of his promise represented by the Memorial card, and this without the consent of the other parties, who though they may be present, or may hear about it, do not by their mere silence consent, since they are not bound to say anything in order to secure their right to have him perform according to the original promise.

As for part (1, b), it is to be recalled that the diocesan stipend regulates the amount to be offered for the High Mass in question (Can. 831, §§1, 2), though a priest can accept a greater sum freely offered, as indicated above.

On the face of the card in question, however, it appears that whatever amount is indicated is offered *towards* a High Mass. Now the amount to be offered for a High Mass is regulated by the diocesan stipend, so whatever the amount is, it seems from the wording of the card that it is offered to make up whatever is

indicated as the diocesan stipend for a High Mass. If all the sums contributed in this way are put together as a stipend for one High Mass it is quite possible that the total will surpass the amount fixed for such a stipend in the diocese. The only way to justify such a total is on the basis of a free offering by all of these people for the one High Mass of an amount in excess of the diocesan stipend. Such an intention, however, does not appear from the face of the card which indicates only that the offering is toward a High Mass, presumably at the rate of the diocesan stipend unless otherwise indicated, and there is no such other indication here.

It would seem, therefore, with regard to part (1, b) of the question, that the priests cannot by using such cards consider themselves authorized to "bunch" all the offerings for one High Mass, but that they must sing as many High Masses as are indicated by the division of the total sum contributed by the sum fixed for the stipend for one High Mass in the diocese. This is because Canon 830 provides that if a person has offered a sum of money for the application of Masses, without indicating their number, it is to be computed according to the stipend of the place in which the donor lived, unless one must lawfully presume that he had a different intention. The mere fact that the person has used a card like that in question does not require one to presume that he intended to give to one big stipend rather than toward the usual High Mass stipend in the diocese.

As for the points contained in the second part of the question, it is to be noted in connection with (2, a) that the pastor is bound by the obligation to apply the Mass for his people according to Canon 339 (Can. 466, 1), and that he is, when lawfully absent from his parish, to apply it himself in the place where he is, or through the agency of the priest who is taking his place in the parish (Can. 466, §5).

According to the statement of facts under part (2, a), it appears that the pastor is present in the parish, not absent. Hence, there seems to be no occasion for applying Canon 466, §5, and he is to apply the Mass for the people himself. The obligation of saying Mass for the people is on the pastor as an incident of his office, and it is for that that he receives a portion of the income from his benefice. He cannot, therefore, put the obligation off on the assistant merely in order to keep for himself the stipend of the High Mass. He cannot transfer the High Mass intention to the assist-

ant, giving the latter the amount for a Low Mass while retaining the rest of the stipend for himself, for he must turn over the whole stipend received, unless the donor expressly permits him to retain something, or it is certain that the excess above the diocesan stipend is given to him with the intention that he personally shall have it (cf. Can. 840, §1).

It would seem, therefore, that the pastor cannot sing a High Mass in place of the Mass "*pro populo*" and turn this obligation over to the assistant, giving the latter the stipend for a Low Mass. The obligation is the pastor's and he can fulfill it through the agency of another only when he is lawfully absent from the parish, which, in the case presented, he is not.

As for the matters mentioned under (2, b), there seems to be some confusion as to which is the "extra" Mass. The Mass "*pro populo*" has to be said by the pastor at all events. If he is able to take a stipend for another Mass that same day, the second Mass would seem to be the "extra" one. In that case, the stipend for that Mass, whether High or Low should be sent on to the Chancery Office. In 1937 the Sacred Congregation of the Council (*AAS*, XXX, 101) considering the question whether a diocesan ordinance was to be sustained which would allow priests celebrating a second Mass to send on only the amount of the diocesan stipend to the Chancery Office, answered that it could not. The argument was that the stipend for a Mass cannot be separated from the celebration and application thereof, unless a contrary intention is proved. This argument was drawn from Canon 840, §1, which treats of manual Masses sent to others to be said, but in the case of the transmission of the stipend after celebration it was argued *a pari*, for want of a precise statement in the Sacred Canons. Even the provision for cases in which the excess beyond the diocesan stipend may be retained was used in that case to bolster the contention that the bishop could not by a general decree provide that all priests who binate shall retain the excess over the diocesan stipend, or retain the offering made by the donor whatever its amount, provided they shall send the diocesan stipend to the Chancery Office.

It would seem, then, with regard to the matters in (2, b), that if the pastor says a Low Mass "*pro populo*" and then sings an extra High Mass for the High Mass stipend, he must transmit the latter stipend to the Chancery Office, since that is the stipend for

his "extra" Mass, and is, therefore, the stipend which he is supposed to send in. Otherwise, he would on the same day be receiving a double compensation, first, that part of his income which obliges him to say the Mass "*pro populo*" and second, the excess beyond the Low Mass stipend which he sends in.

If the higher cost of living today seems to demand that some provision be made for the support of the priests in question, then it is time for the Bishop to consider changing the diocesan stipends, as was done in Italy by Benedict XV after the First World War (*AAS*, XI [1919], 277).

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

THE RETENTION OF THE SPECIAL *COMMUNICANTES* IN A VOTIVE MASS

Question: At a solemn Votive Mass, celebrated during the Octave of the Feast of the Ascension, the question arose as to whether the special *Communicantes* should be said. Some contended that this was restricted to Masses in accordance with the Ordo. *Quid vobis videtur?*

Answer: The rubric of the Missal, governing the recitation of the proper *Communicantes* for the Feast of the Ascension, provides that it be said on the feast itself and during the entire Octave in all Masses which are either of the Octave or of the Sunday within the same or in which the Octave or the Sunday is commemorated. Since all privileged octaves must be commemorated even in Solemn Votive Masses, it follows that the special *Communicantes* will be said in all Masses, even those not *conformes Officio*, during the Octave of the Ascension. This is to be observed even though, because of the concurrence of a Preface proper to the Mass which is celebrated, the Preface of the Ascension is not said. What is said of the *Communicantes* peculiar to the Ascension is to be applied to Masses celebrated during other octaves, which have a special *infra Actionem*, like those of Easter and Pentecost, and also to the recitation of the proper *Hanc igitur*, whenever this occurs. The single exception is that of Requiem Masses celebrated during Octaves which have variants of the prayers *infra Actionem*. The *Requiem* Mass always has the *Communicantes* and the *Hanc igitur* in the usual form, whatever the season of the year. This is

in accordance with the general rule that no variations are to be made in the text of the *Requiem* Masses to accord with the feast or the season on which, or during which, they are celebrated.

CARRYING THE *PAX* TO AN ATTENDING BISHOP

Question: When a bishop assists at Solemn Mass, not in cope and mitre, but in rochet and mozzetta, or mantelletta, who should bring him the *Pax?* Our custom has been to have this done by the sub-deacon before he distributes the *Pax* to the others in choir but some have said that there is a special decree, requiring the deacon to take the *Pax* to the bishop before he gives it to the subdeacon to carry to the clergy in attendance.

Answer: When a bishop presides at Solemn Mass in cope and mitre, or in *cappa magna*, he occupies the throne and his assistant priest brings him the *Pax* after receiving it from the celebrant. This kind of assistance is limited to the Ordinary and to certain greater prelates. If the diocesan Ordinary wears rochet and mozzetta, he does not occupy the throne but a place corresponding to the first choir stall. Visiting bishops, clad in rochet and mantelletta, likewise sit in the places reserved for those first *in choro.* When there is question of the protocol to be followed in the distribution of the *Pax*, a decree of the Congregation of Rites (No. 2089, *ad 5;* Feb. 11, 1702) provides that when Mass is celebrated *coram Episcopo* and the latter has no assistant priest, the deacon as the minister of higher dignity should bear the *Pax* to theBishop. This is extended to the case when the Bishop assists in mozzetta and hence does not occupy the throne or have the attendance of an assistant priest. It may be disputed whether this applies to a visiting bishop outside the limits of his jurisdiction. The whole tenor of the decree just quoted would restrict the case to that of the Ordinary when he assists without an assistant priest, either at the throne or in the first choir-stall. Fortescue (*Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, p. 172) understands it as applying to any bishop present at Solemn Mass outside his diocese, to whom the deacon, not the subdeacon, should bring the *Pax.*

THE LIGHTING OF THE PASCHAL CANDLE

Question: What is the proper time for the lighting of the Paschal candle? Should it be lighted with the other candles before Mass or

should the lighting of it take place just before the singing of the Gospel?

Answer: There are places where we have seen the Paschal candle lighted only before the Gospel of the Mass and no doubt the practice owes its origin to the idea of the Gospel as the light of the truth of Christ. There is, however, no indication in any liturgical book that on the occasions during Eastertide when the Paschal candle is to burn the lighting of it should be deferred to just before the chanting of the Gospel. All indications point to lighting it with the six prescribed candles on the altar before the beginning of Mass. There is, of course, the direction in the Missal that it be extinguished immediately after the Gospel on Ascension Day. This is probably the inspiration of the symbolic, but unauthorized, practice of lighting it only when the Gospel is due at the Masses at which it burns during the forty days after Easter.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE DEFENCE OF THE FAITH

Amid . . . reckless and widespread folly of opinion, it is . . . the office of the Church to undertake the defence of truth and uproot errors from the mind, and this charge has to be at all times sacredly observed by her, seeing that the honor of God and the salvation of men are confided to her keeping. But when necessity compels, not those only who are invested with power of rule are bound to safeguard the integrity of faith, but, as St. Thomas maintains, "Each one is under obligation to show forth his faith, either to instruct and encourage others of the faithful, or to repel the attacks of unbelievers." To recoil before an enemy, or to keep silence when from all sides clamors are raised against truth, is the part of a man either devoid of character or who entertains doubt as to the truth of what he professes to believe. In both cases such mode of behaving is base and insulting to God, and both are incompatible with the salvation of mankind. This kind of conduct is profitable only to the enemies of the faith, for nothing emboldens the wicked so greatly as the lack of courage on the part of the good. Moreover, want of vigor on the part of Christians is so much the more blameworthy, as not seldom little would be needed on their part to bring to naught false charges and refute erroneous opinions; and by always exerting themselves more strenuously they might reckon upon being successful.

—Pope Leo XIII, in *Sapientiae Christianae (The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* [New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903], p. 188).

Analecta

The final 1945 number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the letter of our Holy Father to the Most Rev. Carlo de Ferrari, Archbishop of Trent, dated November 21, 1945[1], commemorating the fourth centenary of the opening of the Council of Trent, and congratulating the Archbishop on the appointment of a Council charged with the responsibility of providing for the due observance of the anniversary.

The observance of the first centenary of the establishment of the Apostleship of Prayer provided our Holy Father with the opportunity of addressing radio messages to Spain and Argentina, the former, on November 18, 1945,[2] and the latter, on October 28, 1945.[3] In the former, our Holy Father lauds the historic zeal of the Spaniards, manifested especially in their maintenance of their Faith through long centuries of invasion on the part of the Moors and in their conversion of the New World. He refers to the appropriateness to the present time of the Act of Consecration of the Spanish people to the Sacred Heart, quoting three passages from it. In the address to Argentina, he refers similarly to the devotion of the people to Christ the King as manifested specifically in the National Eucharistic Congresses and rejoices that in the division of the world into the camps characterized, on the one hand, by hate and the seeking for temporal aggrandizement, but on the other hand, by love and the aspiration for life eternal, the Argentinians have definitely placed themselves in the latter. In both addresses he closes with his Apostolic Benediction.

The tone of the address to the Argentinians on the occasion of the celebration of the centenary of the Apostleship of Prayer marks also the Allocution of November 27, 1945,[4] in which our Holy Father accepted the credentials of His Excellency, Dr. Luis Castiñeiras, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Argentine Republic.

Another Allocution is that of November 29, 1945[5], delivered to a group of Jewish refugees returned from captivity, in which our

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVII (1945), 309.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 321.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 318.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 314.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

Holy Father noted that their presence was a clear indication of the psychological changes that had occurred in national attitudes since their deportation, now more in harmony with the truly Christian obligation of love and with the natural law, both of which the Holy Father has incessantly defended to the extreme limit of his capacity. Their gratitude to him was the clearest proof that they recognized this. In closing, he invoked in their behalf the enlightenment and the protection of Almighty God.

Two Apostolic Constitutions provide for the establishment of new ecclesiastical subdivisions: one in Colombia and the other in Thailand; both issued through the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The former is dated June 15, 1945,[6] and establishes the new Prefecture Apostolic of Labateca from portions of the Diocese of Nueva Pamplona and of the Prefecture Apostolic of Arauca. The latter is dated May 11, 1944,[7] and establishes the new Vicariate Apostolic of Chantaburi from territory previously allocated to the Vicariate Apostolic of Bangkok.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated June 22, 1945[8], contains the authorization for the introduction of the Cause of the Servant of God, Hyacinth M. Cormier, a priest of the Order of Preachers. A second decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated May 21, 1945[9], declares that no obstacle remains to the canonization of Blessed Louis M. Grignon de Montfort, Founder of the Institute of Missionary Priests of the Society of Mary, beatified by Pope Leo XIII on January 22, 1888.

Recent Pontifical Appointments Announced in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Protonotary Apostolics ad instar participantium:

November 3, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lester V. Lyons, of the Diocese of Des Moines.

November 20, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward P. Hoar, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 328.

Domestic Prelates of his Holiness:

November 2, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Anthony Gabriels, of the Diocese of Lansing, and John F. Basso, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

November 3, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Jeremiah F. Costello, Michael B. Schlitz, William J. McMahon, Francis P. Larkin, James P. Danahey, and Thomas P. Murphy, of the Diocese of Des Moines.

November 21, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Sylvester J. Higgins, John J. Boardman, James A. Charters, Raymond J. Campion, Peter W. Fox, Gustave E. Baer, Francis J. Dillon, Daniel J. McCarthy, John F. Cherry, Joseph R. McLaughlin, Joseph F. Stedman, William F. Daley, Francis J. Oechsler, Joseph F. Brophy, and Richard B. McHugh, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

November 22, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Andrew Joseph Gmelch, William Leech, and Hubert A. Spengler, of the Diocese of Natchez.

July 5, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas F. Markham, of the Archdiocese of Boston; Andrew P. Landi, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; Caesar Rinaldi, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

July 14, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Sabo, Edward H. Vurpillat, and John A. Dapp, of the Diocese of Fort Wayne.

September 10, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph McGeough, of the Archdiocese of New York.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

GOD TEACHES THROUGH THE CHURCH

God teaches through the Church in such a way that He alone truly instructs in the doctrine of faith through this society. The Church itself offers no contribution of its own. In other words, the judgment of the Church on matters of faith is subjectively a human judgment, since those who judge are men, but that judgment is divine in its origin and formally divine, since the competent authorities within the Church give their decision through the infallible help of God with which they are endowed. . . . The authorities of the Church, in deciding questions of faith . . . are the instruments of God Who is teaching. They are free instruments, not irrational instruments.

—Thomas Stapleton, in the *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria* (Antwerp, 1596), pp. 488 f.

Book Reviews

WHAT PEOPLE ARE: A STUDY OF NORMAL YOUNG MEN. By Clark W. Heath and others. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1945. Pp. xvi + 141.

The wealth of material reported in this book is too great to permit an adequate summary. It is arranged under the headings: Description of a normal personality, Description of adjustment to environmental and personal conditions, Socio-economic findings, Morphological, Physiological, Medical data, and such as obtained by mental measurement. The choice of twenty-five basic features allows a division of the subjects into three classes of "soundness;" of the first group the characteristics are: well-integrated, pragmatic, practical organizing, vital affect, friendly, humanistic; of the second: incompletely integrated, lack of purpose and values, asocial, unstable autonomic functions, ideational, self-conscious, introspective; a middle group is distinguished mainly by traits as: inhibited, shy, self-driving. The association between the various traits is highly interesting.

To mention just a few remarkable facts: The desire to be "successful" is not as dominant as one might suppose. The variability in regard to athletics and their appreciation is great; with progressing maturation their importance diminishes; about one-fourth of the subjects held a personal belief in a personal God; a slightly larger group maintained an unformulated belief; atheists were few, agnostics more frequent. Ten per cent. were Catholics who showed a noticeable uniformity of belief. The desire for a deeper faith came mostly from the craving to find purpose and meaning in life.

A careful perusal and consideration of the data collected, and particularly of the whole approach is urgently recommended to all concerned with education or guidance. They will discover that there are many things and questions of weight which usually are not given the attention they deserve. The present study is but a beginning. It is, however, one which arouses great hopes and which ought to be pursued also in other places. It will be particularly important to compare the results obtained by such investigations with subjects of different economic and social standards, as well as of different cultural attitudes. This reviewer feels that the abandoning of the specific "psychiatric" approach in interpretation, while retaining the valuable methodology of medico-psychological inquiry, is of importance. It is about time that normal people be no longer viewed as if normalcy were the "minimum degree of abnormality."

RUDOLPH ALLERS, M.D.

WITH PARABLES. A Sermon for every Sunday and Feast of Obligation. By Rev. Arthur Tonne, O.F.M. Emporia: Didde Office Supply and Printing Co., 1945. Pp. 127. $2.00.

The number of sermon-books on the market is conspicuously large. Those among them that are good and serviceable are notoriously few. The present offering of Fr. Tonne has several good qualities which prompt one to class it among the few.

The first noteworthy quality of Fr. Tonne's book of sermons is that each and every sermon in it begins with a story or illustration. This, incidentally, is the only claim to individuality that the author makes for his work (Foreword). In the consistent use of this device he has the sanction of the Master Preacher Himself. But pedagogues old and new have voiced the same precept. Some have even advised the preacher to "drag in" a story rather than go without one. Fr. Tonne at times may seem to be following this injunction. Furthermore, a handful of the stories merit some criticism on other scores. The story on p. 33 taxes the credulity of one who has read the *Pulpit Orator* (1st Moral Sketch for Sexagesima). The qualification "legend has it" might well preface the stories on pp. 57 and 122. Without some further explanation the moral of the story on p. 3 might be falsely drawn by the unlearned, while the statement that climaxes the story on p. 113 is, in this reviewer's opinion, at least unseemly. The soundness of the story device, however, cannot be questioned, and the author's use of it is generally good.

Another good quality of these sermons is that they are expressed in the language of the people. This is a quality that many sermon-books, and perhaps numerous preachers, unfortunately lack. The simplicity and directness bound up in this quality are not something that one naturally falls into through the mere failure to strive to be profound. It is an art, and it is usually acquired only through close observation and thought and striving. Many a preacher of learning and good will has failed to get his message across to the people because he failed to speak their language; his sermons were weighted down unduly with the technical language of theology or with the trappings of an elevated style. Let it be noted that the language of the "man *in* the street" is not the language of the "man *of* the street." Fr. Tonne speaks throughout the language of the former.

The themes for the various Sundays and Feasts, as well as the applications, are timely. The development is consistently good. Fr. Tonne always has something to say, and in the saying achieves unity and coherence. The sermons on the average contain about nine hundred words. The format is quite desirable for a sermon-book: a slim volume with a spiral loose-leaf binding.

ROBERT E. REGAN, O.S.A.

LIVING WITH CHRIST IN GOD. By Bernières-Louvigny. English version by Sister Mary Aloysi Kiener. New York and Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet Co., 1946. Pp. 288. $2.50.

The author of this book, Jean de Bernières de Louvigny, was a layman who held a responsible government post at Caen in the middle years of the seventeenth century. Aside from his official duties, his whole interest was in religion. He founded a hermitage where he was surrounded by a group of disciples; each had his own cell, but they met together for meals and edifying conversation, chiefly on the subject of prayer, for the practise of mental prayer was the special interest of their life, though they also visited the sick and did other works of active charity. Bernières had a rather extensive influence, and his spiritual advice and direction were much esteemed; St. John Eudes and Bishop Laval were among those with whom he was in contact. The Ven. Marie de l'Incarnation (Ursuline) thought highly of him; he had been very helpful in her going to Quebec, and for twenty years they carried on a regular correspondence. Bernières published nothing himself; but after his death friends made two collections of his manuscripts, somewhat overlapping, and these went through many editions in a few years. However, Italian translations were quickly put on the Index as tending to Quietism, and are still there. Corrected editions were issued in the nineteenth century.

The present volume is a translation of a German translation, and it seems to have undergone considerable modification somewhere on its journey—including the addition of a few quotations from Mme. Guyon, who was only eleven years old when Bernières died. It is written in a loose form—a series of considerations, elevations, aspirations, and apostrophes. The purpose of the book is the admirable one of encouraging the reader to a life of greater recollection and prayer, in fact to a definitely contemplative life. Abandonment to God, the will of God, surrender of all affection for creatures, a strong preference for solitude and peace of soul and waiting upon God, "union with the sentiments of Christ"—such are the emphases. Bernières is said to have had roots in the doctrines of Bérulle, and the influences of the French School appear occasionally in this volume. Yet the general tone is different, and it is not hard to see why modern writers classify Bernières as a pre-Quietist. The book contains much that is true and some that is beautiful, and statements in one place that may be exaggerated usually find a correction elsewhere. Nevertheless, while Bernières was a holy man, he is not one of the great mystical writers, and the ordinary reader who seeks inspiration or guidance would do better to go to the recognized saints and mystics.

Is this reviewer peculiar in being exasperated by a constant use of the English feminine pronouns *she* and *her* in referring to the human soul?

CARLETON M. SAGE, S.S.

GUERILLA PADRE IN MINDANAO. By Edward Haggerty, S.J. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1946. Pp. xii + 257. $2.75.

Fr. Haggerty has spent the greater part of his priestly life in colleges in the Philippines. He had scarcely begun his career as Director of the Ateneo de Cagayan, Mindanao, an institution with five modern buildings and nearly a thousand students, when the conquering Japs came to take over. But they met with fierce and sustained resistance from the natives, who took to guerilla warfare in the hills, where Fr. Haggerty joined them and remained with them. It occurred to him that this resistance effort was significant enough both for the vigor and for the spirit with which it was carried on to merit recording and this he attempted in what is offered to us in this volume. Because of the fact that it was written with the purpose he had in mind and in the circumstances in which he found himself, this work became at once a first-hand account of an important movement and a most interesting diary of an intensive campaign. It may well serve as a significant piece of evidence for the loyalty of the people of the Philippines in their request for statehood.

It is certainly one of the most detailed diaries of the war and should win for the author the highest commendation for his valiant services during the campaign and for his splendid account of it.

F. A. MULLIN

SERMON OUTLINES. By Rev. William R. O'Connor. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1945. Pp. 133. $1.25.

To pass judgment on a collection of sermons is to commit oneself to a theory of sermonizing. It is, at times, a precarious bit of business, involving much more than Canon 1347 or the triads of Quintilian. For many mysterious reasons, sermons are liked or disliked; and this merely accentuates the fact that a preacher cannot always hope to please his entire congregation.

Fr. O'Connor does not attempt to reach all segments of his congregation. He does not address himself to the over-emotional or to the over-intellectual. But he does reach the vast and appreciative flock, which includes just about everyone from the solemn-faced laborer at

the early Mass to the inclined-to-be but not actually bored stenographer at the "twelve fifteen."

There is one thing particularly that we like about Fr. O'Connor's sermons. They are not graceful; they are not written for the eye. They are not written for sermon anthologies, or for book reports in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* They avoid anything that approaches a Ciceronian period; and there is not even a suspicion of a *callida junctura* to be found from the First Sunday in Advent to the Twenty-Fourth Sunday after Pentecost. This will not be pleasant news to those clerical classicists who persist in coming up out of their deep Bandusian fountains dripping with oratory. Fr. O'Connor, we suspect, does not believe in pulpit oratory—at least not for his typical Sunday congregation.

Comprising, as it does, fifty-nine compact instructions for every Sunday and major feast on the Church calendar, *Sermon Outlines* should prove to be an inspiration and help not only to seminarians who are preparing for the pulpit, but especially for the second and third assistants who, due to the multiplicity of their priestly functions, merit an occasional lift in the right Sunday morning direction.

T. J. Mulvey, O.M.I.

Medical Ethics for Nurses. By Charles J. McFadden, O.S.A., Ph.D. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co., 1946. Pp. xiii + 356. $3.00.

Many problems in the field of medical ethics are not adequately discussed in the standard manuals of philosophy and theology. Accordingly, nurses and doctors, as well as priests who are consulted by members of the nursing and medical profession, are often unable to find a satisfactory scientific treatment of certain questions which are vitally important from the standpoint of Catholic morality. A splendid contribution in the way of supplying this need, as far as the nursing profession is concerned, is Fr. McFadden's recent work.

The book is made up of fifteen chapters. The first two are of a general nature, intended to explain the basic principles of ethics. This section treats of such matters as the nature and the division of moral acts, the natural law, conscience, and the principle of the two-fold effect. The remaining thirteen chapters are concerned with particular questions on which a Catholic nurse is expected to have correct notions, such as the purposes of marriage, contraception, sterilization, abortion, co-operation in illicit operations, professional secrecy, and the spiritual care of the dying. An appendix contains some rules regarding the care of non-Catholic patients in danger of death, the moral code of Catholic hospitals, the formula of the oath of Hippocrates, etc.

Two qualities of Fr. McFadden's book call for special commendation. First, it is thoroughly up-to-date. It presents and discusses thoroughly from the standpoint of Catholic moral principles problems that are encountered by nurses and doctors every day at the present time, such as those involved in artificial insemination, the use of the "rhythm," the procuring of semen for examination, the treatment of cancer of the breast by irradiation of the ovaries, the drawing off of the amniotic fluid in the case of hydramnion, etc. Second, Fr. McFadden essays a definite solution of each of the problems he treats, thus pointing out a practical course of action for the nurse, even though it is not always a solution that all theologians would admit. Such, for example, are his norms for co-operation in an illicit operation, and his advice regarding the baptism of an unconscious dying person about whom nothing is known.

Each chapter terminates with a series of very helpful problems for discussion on the subjects presented in the chapter. A well-chosen list of books, pamphlets, and articles for accessory reading is also given at the end of each chapter. The explanation of this sensible method is given thus by Fr. McFadden: "A great deal of consideration was given to the advisability of footnotes in this work. For the most part, references, if made, would be to the classical works on Moral Theology. These works would usually be in Latin, and would neither be available to the average nurse nor within her intellectual grasp. . . . Teachers who would be interested in consulting the standard works on Moral Theology, are, for the most part, already familiar with them. For this reason it was thought best not to burden the text with footnotes, but to add a list of appropriate reading references at the end of each chapter."

A feature not to be overlooked is the foreword by Msgr. Fulton Sheen, with its inspiring explanation of the importance of suffering in human life: "Unless there is the crown of thorns, there will never be the halo of light; unless there is the cross, there will never be an empty tomb; unless we lose our life, we shall never find it; unless we are crucified with Christ, we shall never rise with Christ."

The clear language of the book can be understood by any person of average intelligence and high school education. Every Catholic nurse would profit intellectually and spiritually from its perusal.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By Rev. Edward Dahmus. Belleville, Ill.: Buechler Publishing Co., 1946. Pp. x + 96. $1.50.

This is really a prayer book in both format and content. It is not

concerned with history or dogma but presents a very understandable and devotional concept of the Mass. It is a novel presentation of the idea of Christ's daily immolation of Himself along with His mystical body in the celebration of Mass. The thought which furnishes the *leit-motif* of the book is that the Mass is distinctively a memorial service, which is a development of the *Unde et Memores* though not merely a memorial but a sacrifice, in which the faithful as members of the Mystical Body have a real share with their Divine Head.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice is, in the author's concept, a mystery drama in three acts. The first act, which is that of the Passion, extends up to the consecration. Here the Mystical Body of Christ, symbolically "incarnate" in bread and wine, offers itself for the Eucharistic Union with its Head. The perishable substance of bread and wine "dies" in transubstantiation. While there can be no doubt as to the orthodox character of the author's meaning, and the idea of the death of the substance of the bread and wine in transubstantiation is a strikingly dramatic concept, yet there is something rather inaccurate in it since transubstantiation is not a destruction of the substance of the bread and wine but a transformation of it into the already existing substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The second act of the liturgical drama is that of the Resurrection, and consists entirely in the Consecration, where from the "dead" substance of bread and wine a new living substance arises in the Holy Eucharist. The third act, from the elevation to the end of Mass, commemorates the ascension. Here is effected the mystic ascension of the faithful to that Eucharistic Banquet in preparation for which the angel of the Lord is petitioned to bear the consecrated elements to the "altar on high." There we are privileged to sit at the Father's table, where after saying grace, the "Our Father," the bread is broken and, as we partake of it, we are "filled with every heavenly blessing."

All in all, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* forms an interesting and edifying book. Its chief defect, which will be to many its principal merit, is its effort of over-simplification of a complex rite, which has been the growth of centuries and which gives evidence of its antiquity and diversified history in prayers and ceremonies all of which cannot be convincingly explained in detail.

The mechanical make-up of the little book is attractive. Attention should be called to its many specially-drawn illustrations, which contribute much to its appeal.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

Book Notes

In *The Incarnation of the Word of God* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946. Pp. 96. $1.50) an Anglican religious of C.S.M.V. offers an excellent English translation of *De incarnatione Verbi Dei* of St. Athanasius. This translation, intended not only for theological students but for the general reader, brings this great classic of the fourth century within the reach of the ordinary Christians of the present day. The construction of the long Greek sentences in many cases has been simplified; the meaning is occasionally brought out by paraphrase rather than by direct translation, and in other places it has been slightly condensed. The reader will find that the *De incarnatione* has a vital message for the twentieth century as for the fourth because it has the single-minded grasp of essentials and the breadth of vision which are born in times of persecution of the faith. The Introduction is written by C. S. Lewis.

Dr. Leo Pyzalski, C.SS.R., is the author of several handy-sized volumes that have proved veritable treasures to hundreds of religious throughout the United States and Europe. His latest work, *School Sister's Vademecum* (Pine Ridge, Ill.: Holy Legion Office, 1945. $1.20), deals with problems and difficulties that are common to teaching sisters as a class, such as over-work, the reconciliation of the obligations arising from the teaching office and the religious life, the preservation of recollection, and adaptation to new methods in teaching. The work is extremely valuable for sisters in helping them to face and solve these problems. Moreover, the director or confessor of sisters will find in this book correct and appropriate answers and attitudes of mind to be suggested to conscientious sisters disturbed by doubts and scruples regarding overactivity, recollection, obstacles to perfection, and other similar problems.

The thirty-fourth volume of *Historical Records and Studies* (New York: The United States Historical Society, 1945. Pp. 189) contains articles covering a wide variety of interesting subjects. Charles Tansill, Ph. D. presents a good overall picture of Pope Benedict XV's plan for a just and durable peace. This was originally delivered before the annual meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society, New York, Nov. 17, 1944. Sr. Mary Constance Golden, R.S.M., has written an informative article dealing with Catholic Eastern Churches in New York City. The two remaining papers represent dissertations which were presented to Catholic University and Fordham University respectively in partial fulfillment for the degrees of Master of Arts. The first, written by Sr. M. Bernetta Brislen, O.S.F., is given over to a study of the Episcopacy of Leonard Neale, the second Archbishop of Baltimore. The second, written by Rev. Arthur F. Nugent, is entitled "The Constitution and the Declaration." To show that the Declaration and the Constitution are "parts of one consistent whole," the author singles out the three principles of equality, unalienable rights, and consent of the governed as enunciated in the Declaration, explains these principles of government in the light of scholastic philosophy, and then treats of the application of these principles to the Constitution. Both dissertations are furnished with bibliographies. Sr. Bernetta, in an appendix, presents several letters which had not been previously published.

El Rio del Espiritu Santo (New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1945. Pp. xiii + 182) is the twenty-first volume of the monograph series of the United States Catholic Historical Society. Its author, Jean Delanglez, S.J., Ph.D., is well known for his work in American Church History, especially since the publication of his doctoral dissertation, *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana: 1700-1763.* His field of specialized work has centered about

the cartography and early history of the Great Lakes Region and the Mississippi Valley. The present work is a thorough, painstaking, historical and cartographical study on the relation between rivers identified as Rio del Espiritu Santo and the Mississippi. Based on a penetrating study of maps of the interior of the United States between the Appalachian Range and the Rocky Mountains, the present study argues that the Mississippi was not the Rio del Espiritu Santo of the Spanish geographers. Such a negative conclusion might be disappointing, but the author honestly admits that it is the only conclusion justified by the evidence. With the documents now available, the identity of the Rio del Espiritu Santo cannot be determined. Limited as the author's conclusion may be, nevertheless his study throws considerable light on the historical cartography of the Gulf Coast and on that part of Spanish Florida lying west of the eighty-fourth meridian. This is a work for specialists, but a work that recommends itself by detailed thoroughness of research and scrupulous honesty in presenting conclusions.

Father Martindale, back from five years internment in Denmark, has given us a small work, *Creative Love* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946. Pp. 48. $1.00). The six brief chapters were originally Holy Week talks delivered on the radio. But the talks themselves are by no means seasonal or dated. They could be read with equal profit on Christmas morning or on Good Friday evening. "We shall not speak exclusively of the sufferings and death of Christ, but try to see what led up to them, and, to what they themselves led up." The talks are but variations of the simple, fundamental, beautiful theme, "God is in love with us." They reveal the author's grasp of the harmony in Catholic doctrine and, what is more important, a personal understanding that could flow only from rich meditation.

The Peacemaker (New York: Scapular Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 212. $2.50) by John Mathias Haffert has been published especially for veterans of the recent war, but it merits the attention of all. It is the story of the military hero of Portugal's fight for independence in the fourteenth century, Blessed Nuno Alvarez Pereira. His brilliant career as soldier and governor, his love for Mary and her poor, his last years as a lowly *donato* in the Carmelite monastery which he had built—all this is told in an attractive style. The two final chapters are concerned with Our Lady's appearance at Fatima with rosary and scapular, and to the message which she there gave. Blessed Nuno had there dedicated himself to Mary, and there had won two major victories. "Without laying aside my Carmelite habit," he said, "but with my rosary in one hand and my sword in the other, I will come to defend the cause of God."

A very refreshing book for spiritual reading is the recent publication *Whom Thou Seekest* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1946. Pp. x + 229. $2.00). The book is, in part at least, a compilation of meditations that have appeared in various Catholic publications, such as *America* and the *Catholic World*. The term meditation must be taken loosely when applied to this book. The subject is presented in a form more fitted for spiritual reading than for methodical mental prayer. A prayerful, attentive reading was called meditation in former days. The work is divided into three books, containing twenty-five, twenty-six, and twenty-seven chapters respectively. It is difficult to see the criterion followed in making this division. Chapters dealing with the same subject, *e.g.*, prayer, are found in each one of the three books. Yet, after careful study there appears a certain unity in a variety of subjects in each of the three books. Thus the first book treats mostly of Faith and Prayer, the second of Faith and the Eucharist, the third of the Eucharist and the Church. A clear and beautiful style, a prayerful form of colloquy, and an intense feeling and sincerity of expression pervading every page make of this book a source of inspiration for any soul in the quest for God. The author is anonymous.